

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION
AND HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

RACE TO THE TOP
EARLY LEARNING CHALLENGE

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO APPLICANTS WORKSHOP

400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, September 13, 2011

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

PRESENTERS:

Jacqueline Jones, Senior Advisor on Early Learning to the Secretary, Office of the Secretary, ED

Joan Lombardi, Deputy Assistant Secretary and Inter-Departmental Liaison for Early Childhood Development, ACF, HHS

Ngozi Onunaku, Office of the Assistant Secretary, ACF, HHS

Beth Caron, Office of the Deputy Secretary, ED

Jennifer Tschantz, Office of the Secretary, ED

Shannon Rudisill, Office of Child Care, ACF, HHS

Richard Gonzales, Office of the Assistant Secretary, ACF, HHS

Steven Hicks, Office of the Secretary, ED

Yvette Sanchez Fuentes, Office of Head Start, ACF, HHS

Miriam Calderon, Office of the Assistant Secretary, ACF, HHS

Joanne Weiss, Chief of Staff, ED

Jane Hess, Office of the General Counsel, ED

Rachel Peternith, Office of the General Counsel, ED

George Askew, Office of the Assistant Secretary, ACF, HHS

ATTENDEES who asked questions during session:

Jessica Sutter
Betty Hyde
Reeva Murphy
Kelly Maxwell
Jennifer Park
Carol Miller
Bridget Ramsey
Dan Haggard
Jillian
Cathy Grace
Liz Kelley
Jon Furr
Deborah Jonas
Barbara Minzenberg
Deb Mathias
Joan Blough
Leanne Barrett
Stephanie Siddens
Theresa Hawley
Elizabeth Burke Bryant
Pat Hammer
Elizabeth Whitehouse
Gretchen Grove-DeJarnett
Karen
Harriet
Tracey
Anita
Erica
Charlene

P R O C E E D I N G S

(9:30 a.m.)

1
2
3 DR. JONES: I feel stunningly powerful that I
4 actually got you to do this. All right. I think we
5 should get started.

6 Good morning, everybody. My name is -- oh,
7 good morning. We can say good morning back. My name
8 is Jacqueline Jones, and I work in the Education
9 Department. Along with my colleague Joan Lombardi and
10 the Department of Health and Human Services, I want to
11 welcome you all and thank you so much for joining us
12 and participating in this TA workshop for the Race to
13 the Top - Early Learning Challenge competition.

14 This workshop is a more in-depth follow-up to
15 the TA Webinar we hosted on September 1st. These TA
16 sessions were designed for people from the states who
17 have primary responsibility for completing the
18 applications for the Race to the Top - Early Learning
19 challenge. Today 43 states, the District of Columbia,
20 the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are represented here in
21 D.C. and across the country in the HHS regional
22 offices. Our goal is for all of you to walk away
23 understanding what it takes to develop a strong
24 application. We will take as many questions as we can
25 throughout the day, and we'll make it clear to you how

1 you can get further questions answered.

2 In addition to the representatives from the
3 states, we have members of the public and the press
4 attending this workshop. We're delighted that there is
5 so much interest in the Early Learning Challenge, but I
6 want to underscore that this workshop is for states, so
7 we ask that members of the state teams be able to ask
8 questions and participate in question and answer
9 sessions first, and then if we have time we will
10 address questions from the press and the public. But
11 it is states first.

12 Okay. Let's see. I actually did the slide.
13 Good.

14 As I've said, we hope to provide information
15 that will help you write high-quality applications, and
16 we'll provide more details on the content of the
17 applications so that you have a better understanding of
18 selection criteria, priorities, definitions and other
19 requirements. In addition, we want you to walk away
20 understanding the budget section, reviewer guidelines
21 and how to submit an application. We want to answer
22 all the questions we can, but remember we may not be
23 able to answer questions about content. We will not be
24 able to answer questions about the content of your
25 applications. That's up to you. We can, however,

1 answer technical, clarifying and logistical questions,
2 and if we don't know the answers today we'll write down
3 the questions and get the answers out as soon as we're
4 able.

5 So you can see from this agenda we have a lot
6 of information to cover today. We will stick to this
7 schedule, so please be prompt returning from lunch and
8 breaks. And each presenter has built in time for
9 question and answers.

10 Also today we have a lot of people
11 represented, and I just want to say this has been such
12 a group effort. A variety of people from both Health
13 and Human Services and Education are here to present to
14 you today, all of whom have been absolutely integral to
15 writing this notice. In addition to the presenters we
16 have federal staff who will support the presenters as
17 we're responding.

18 Federal staff, you can wave. You guys want
19 to wave to the people? They're waving over there.
20 They get a little applause.

21 This has been an extraordinary collaborative
22 endeavor, and Joan is going to lead you through the
23 next part of the session.

24 This is the passing of the clicker.

25 DR. LOMBARDI: Good morning, and good morning

1 to everyone in the regions. It's really a heartwarming
2 feeling to look out on this audience and to feel the
3 excitement that we're feeling as we move the agenda
4 forward for young children. Thank you for your
5 dedication to this as we get started, to your
6 willingness to continue to serve the issue and for
7 traveling to whatever location you're at this morning.
8 I too want to join Jacqueline in telling you it's been
9 a wonderful experience, a real collaboration between
10 the two departments, and we think it's historic, and we
11 know that you're reflecting that sense of collaboration
12 as you move forward and also want to thank the team
13 that is just like this in their efforts to work
14 together.

15 So I want to start with the ground rules. As
16 we just mentioned, we've built in time in each section
17 for you to all ask a lot of questions. When we open up
18 for questions we'll take questions from both states
19 here in D.C. and from states participating in the
20 regional offices. For those of you in the regional
21 offices there is a person designated as the question
22 collector. This person will periodically collect
23 questions from the states in your region and then email
24 them to us. We have someone here in D.C. that will be
25 constantly monitoring the Race to the Top - Early

1 Learning Challenge email box. This person will share
2 the questions from the regions. We believe this will
3 be the most efficient way to answer as many questions
4 as possible given the tight timelines.

5 We ask you one thing, to please state your
6 first and last name when you're asking a question
7 because we're transcribing this, and in the regions if
8 you'd also add your regional location.

9 Additionally, during both lunch and afternoon
10 breaks our team will be meeting together to discuss any
11 unanswered questions. We really want you to leave here
12 feeling that we've at least attempted to answer as many
13 questions as we can. So if your question has not been
14 answered, please write it on a note card and hand it to
15 one of us to put the questions in a basket. When we
16 reconvene we'll try to answer the questions that we've
17 not gotten to up to that point.

18 Again, for those of you in the regions, send
19 your questions via the designated person who will email
20 them to the mailbox. Ask questions publicly, not
21 during the breaks. Ask them publicly. We won't be
22 answering questions during the breaks. We want this to
23 be a level playing field, and we want everyone to hear
24 all of the answers. Time is limited, so try to
25 prioritize your big questions.

1 This is a very familiar slide to you by now
2 I'm sure. We used it on the September 1st Webinar.
3 We'll not be reviewing the slides presented during that
4 Webinar, and we're assuming that most of you were able
5 to participate or had an opportunity to review the
6 slides or the transcript posted on the website. We
7 did, however, want to remind you of the different
8 pieces in the notice outlined on this slide.

9 We also want to remind you that the content
10 in the notice is the same content that appears in the
11 application. We know there were two documents. We'll
12 be referring to the application throughout the day.
13 Since the application is the document that you'll be
14 working with, the page numbers provided on the slides
15 refer to the application.

16 So let's start with defined terms. We wanted
17 to remind you as we get started about the importance of
18 the defined terms, and here are some of them. You'll
19 see a few of the most frequently defined terms. All
20 defined terms, of course, can be found on pages 14
21 through 19 in the application. Critical information is
22 included in the definition, so we took these
23 definitions very seriously. We encourage you to spend
24 time reviewing the definitions, referring back to the
25 definitions as you prepare your applications. We also

1 highlight a few of these as we go through the
2 presentation, so we'll be referring to these as we go
3 along.

4 We want to start with how to develop a
5 quality application. Before we dive into the heart of
6 the selection criteria, we wanted to share some big-
7 picture thoughts on how to go about developing a strong
8 application, and I'm sure you've had many discussions
9 about this already back in your states.

10 First of all, the Early Learning Challenge is
11 designed to create a tremendous opportunity for states
12 to pull together their various early learning and
13 development programs and supporters and build a
14 coordinated system. This is what we've all been
15 waiting for, for this moment to really make everything
16 align. One, it aligns resources with policies and
17 increases access to high-quality programs for those
18 children most at need. We hope that the process of
19 writing the application will build on the interagency
20 work in your state and that the applications will
21 reflect the collective work of the state teams, as this
22 application reflects our collective work at the federal
23 level. We believe, and as reflected in the notice, an
24 application developed using this collaborative approach
25 and building on existing collaborations is likely to

1 have a greater impact and be more sustainable.

2 In addition, a quality application has to
3 address the absolute priority of this competition
4 including high-quality plans that clearly articulate
5 how the work will be done, by whom and set goals that
6 are ambitious and achievable and we'll come back to
7 both of those terms.

8 Let's start our closer look at the
9 application now. So let's start with the absolute
10 priority. You will not write to this priority
11 separately. Rather, the intent of the absolute
12 priority is to act as a check. Here's how it will
13 work. After scoring all the selection criteria in a
14 state application, reviewers will reflect back across
15 the entire application to make sure that the states
16 have developed a complete plan that includes all of the
17 important pieces needed to move the state forward. So
18 it's an extra check. So they [reviewers] will make
19 sure the plan is comprehensive, that it's coherent,
20 that the participating state agencies are integrating
21 and aligning their resources and policies, that we're
22 moving away from these silos that have been the history
23 of our field, that a common tiered, quality rating and
24 improvement system is being proposed across all
25 programs and that the state is making strategic

1 improvements in each of the focused investment areas.
2 Be sure that throughout the application you articulate
3 your decisions about what reforms to focus on, that
4 these reforms are within your reach and that they will
5 result in moving your state forward in a way that will
6 have a positive impact. So you have a lot of things to
7 balance in doing this.

8 Applications must meet the absolute priority
9 to be considered for funding. A state meets the
10 absolute priority if a majority of the reviewers
11 determines that the application has met it. And so
12 we'll come back to questions, I'm sure, along the way
13 about that.

14 Turning to a high-quality plan, in many of
15 the criteria you've been developing high-quality plans.
16 That's a term that I'm sure you talked about a lot in
17 your meetings back in your states. This is a defined
18 term again in the application, and here you see the
19 elements that should be in a high-quality plan -A
20 through I. They're very important to focus on.

21 We want to highlight an important phrase in
22 the stem: any plan that is feasible and has a high
23 probability of successful implementation. That's
24 really the definition, the beginning of the definition
25 of a high-quality plan, that it's feasible and that it

1 has a high probability of successful implementation,
2 and you need to be describing in your plan how it is
3 feasible and why you think it has a high probability of
4 successful implementation. In the high-quality plan
5 you want to be sure to discuss the specific activities
6 to be implemented and where and how they will
7 ultimately result in statewide implementation,
8 presenting plans that aim high and are realistic, and
9 that's the balance. These high-quality plans are the
10 backbone of your application, so take care in
11 developing the plans and make sure they are truly high
12 quality.

13 In the Race to the Top applications we
14 received, the Department of Education received last
15 year, some states created a template for a plan that
16 included all the key components. So in other words,
17 every time you're writing a high-quality plan you're
18 making sure that every one of these A through I is
19 addressed, and I think that's an important point. They
20 inserted these plans into their narrative in responses
21 to the relevant selection criteria. Because the plans
22 were consistently structured throughout the application
23 the reviewers found them easier to understand. So it
24 makes sense that you want to address each of these key
25 elements that are enumerated in the definition of a

1 high-quality plan in your application and be clear
2 about that.

3 Another term that we use a lot is ambitious
4 yet achievable.

5 The term is used in the application both around setting
6 goals -- in selection criteria (A)(2) you'll see it --
7 and in setting targets in the performance measures. So
8 both in the goals and in the performance measures. We
9 want to underscore that it's important for you to aim
10 high but to do so in a feasible and realistic manner.
11 We all have had goals in our work, but we have to be
12 realistic about what we can accomplish, and you're
13 going to be judged along the way if you win this
14 competition by that plan, so you want to make sure that
15 it's realistic.

16 Reviewers will make the judgment on whether
17 or not the state has adequately set a high bar and
18 whether or not the high bar is achievable. So you'll
19 have to make sure you articulate that in your state
20 plans. If you win a grant, you'll be held to achieving
21 these targets and goals, another reason to assure that
22 they're achievable. And I can't emphasize that enough.
23 We all have such high hopes that we sometimes want to
24 make sure that we balance those two out.

25 Let me move finally, before I turn it over to

1 the next presenter in our terrific team, about the
2 scoring rubric, and I'm sure you've spent a lot of time
3 thinking about the scoring rubric. We've published and
4 made available to you all the scoring guidance that the
5 reviewers will get. We're sharing this with you to
6 make the competition totally transparent. We developed
7 two types of scoring rubrics to guide the reviewers in
8 scoring different types of criteria, so for every
9 section -- remember the sections are broken down, and
10 they all total 300 points -- for every section the
11 reviewers will be scoring that section and deciding how
12 many points you get for that section using the scoring
13 rubric. Some of the criteria require a focus on
14 quality responses only, whereas others require a focus
15 on the quality dimension with an assessment of where a
16 state is with its implementation because we know in
17 most of the cases you've already been doing some of
18 this. So we want to know where you are in the
19 implementation process.

20 Pages 108 and 109 include a table outlining
21 the scoring rubric reviewers will use to evaluate each
22 criteria, so those are two important pages. The
23 purpose of these rubrics is to guide the reviewer when
24 awarding the points. So you want to look at that when
25 you're developing each of your sections and think about

1 the way the reviewer will judge your application. And
2 again, there are different rubrics. Most of the
3 criteria are scored with the quality and implementation
4 rubric, but there are two different ones.

5

6 Let me talk first about the quality rubric,
7 and you can view it on pages 108 and 109 again, if you
8 have your application with you, that there are a few
9 places where the reviewers are using the quality
10 rubric -- ,
11 the reviewers will be using the quality rubric. When
12 using the quality rubric on those criteria where it's
13 specified, reviewers will use their judgment to
14 determine whether a response is of high, medium or low
15 quality. We have not defined high, medium and low
16 quality, although we have, as you know, defined what a
17 high-quality plan is, and that is what they'll be
18 thinking about when the reviewers are deciding whether
19 this is a high, medium or low-quality plan. They'll go
20 back to those elements in a high-quality plan that I
21 just mentioned. So you have to put those two pieces
22 together. Reviewers will be called on to use their
23 expertise and their judgment. So that's the quality
24 rubric.

25

If we move on to the quality and

1 implementation rubric, which you'll notice, is used
2 much more frequently by -- will be used much more
3 frequently by the reviewers in judging the sections,
4 the quality and implementation rubric will be used when
5 reviewers are evaluating criteria that includes plans
6 and/or existing implementation. As you can see, more
7 points are awarded for implementation over plans. In
8 other words, how much have you already done? However,
9 quality is valued more than just implementation alone.
10 So what does that really mean? What it means is that
11 although there may have been a lot of implementation,
12 it wasn't being done well, and so there's a balance
13 again. All of this is a balance, and what we're
14 looking for is the quality of the implementation.

15 For example, a reviewer who determines a plan
16 is low quality but fully implemented could only award
17 up to let's say 20 percent of the available points,
18 where a high-quality plan that is not yet implemented
19 could earn between 40 and 60 percent of the available
20 points. We do not define the levels of implementation,
21 minimally, partially, substantially or fully. Again,
22 we rely on our reviewers' judgment.

23 I want to stop there before I talk a little
24 bit about the reviewers. I know -- I assume that there
25 will be questions about the scoring rubric. Since it

1 varies by every section, we're going to hope to answer
2 your scoring rubric questions as we discuss the
3 sections. So you might want to hold those, if they're
4 specific, to a particular section.

5 Let me conclude my section here about the
6 peer reviewers, and I again want to underscore that
7 your applications will be reviewed by outside,
8 independent reviewers. We are currently in the process
9 of identifying a pool of high-quality reviewers for the
10 challenge grant competition. We'll use independent
11 peer reviewers chosen from a pool of qualified
12 educators, scholars and other individuals knowledgeable
13 about early learning and development. They are really
14 doing a terrific job of thoroughly screening the
15 applications to be a reviewer for conflict of interest
16 to ensure a fair and competitive review process.
17 Reviewers will participate in an intensive training
18 similar to this TA workshop to ensure that they
19 understand the notice and the review guidelines. We
20 will be sharing a bit more information about the review
21 process later on.

22 So we're in the process of selecting the
23 reviewers. We haven't finished that process yet, but I
24 just want to assure everybody that we're doing
25 everything we can to make sure that it's a fair process

1 and that they don't have conflicts of interest.

2 What's been I think important to all of us
3 here, before I turn this over, is the excitement that
4 you've been showing, the enthusiasm, and we want to
5 assure the fairness of the process. This is a level
6 playing field, and that's the way we want to start this
7 competition. So I'm going to now turn it over.

8 Oh, take questions first. Sorry. And I'm
9 going to be joined by our folks that can help amplify
10 the answers to those questions.

11 Do we have questions either in the room or in
12 the regions?

13 And Beth Caron is joining us who will be
14 answering several of the questions.

15 Questions? Go ahead. Name.

16 MS. SUTTER: Hi. Jessica Sutter from
17 Washington, D.C.'s Office of the Deputy Mayor for
18 Education.

19 Question about the reviewers reviewing the
20 applications. Are they -- is an individual reviewer
21 reviewing an entire application, or are teams of
22 reviewers reviewing particular portions of applications
23 and then other reviewers reviewing other portions?

24 DR. LOMBARDI: That's a very good question,
25 and Beth is going to answer it.

1 MS. CARON: There will be a team -- can you
2 hear me?

3 (Attendees indicate yes.)

4 MS. CARON: Okay. A team of five reviewers
5 who are reviewing each application, and they will
6 probably review -- it depends on how many reviewers we
7 have and how many applications we have, but we're
8 anticipating they'll review about three applications
9 each so that panel each -- there are five reviewers who
10 will review each application so --

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In its entirety?

12 MS. CARON: In its entirety, right.

13 DR. LOMBARDI: Right. So it won't be parts.
14 It will be a full application by this team of five.

15 Next question? Go ahead.

16 MS. CARON: Can you wait for the microphone
17 so we can get it on the transcription? Thanks.

18 DR. LOMBARDI: Yeah. We've got mic people
19 who are moving about the room

20 MS. HYDE: Okay. Sorry. Betty Hyde, State
21 of Washington.

22 So after you do that, you're going to get a
23 bunch of ratings. Are you then going to go across
24 raters and just rank order and draw lines or is there a
25 mode to the process --

1 MS. CARON: We'll average the five scores
2 across each set of panelists for each application, and
3 then they'll be rank ordered according to the score.

4 MS. HYDE: Okay. And you'll just draw lines?
5 Okay. Thank you.

6 MS. CARON: Um-hum. Sorry.

7 DR. LOMBARDI: Other questions? People
8 haven't had their second coffee yet. Go ahead.

9 Yeah, we have a mic here.

10 MS. CARON: We built these pillars in the way
11 to make it harder for --

12 MS. MURPHY: Reeva Murphy, Vermont Department
13 for Children and Families.

14 If you were resurrecting a strategy that
15 you'd used in the past and didn't any longer have
16 funding for it, what does that -- how does that look in
17 terms of implementation? Like it had been implemented,
18 is no longer, but you thought it had value and was
19 coming back. What would that --

20 MS. CARON: That's a situation specific to
21 your state so we can't speculate on how you should
22 write that or how that would look or how reviewers will
23 score it. But again, this is about putting your best
24 foot forward and being able to show them what you've
25 done, what you're planning to do and just laying it all

1 out. But we can't get more specific than that.

2 DR. LOMBARDI: You know, you have to make
3 judgment calls. All of you have to make judgment calls
4 and balance and be honest, what worked, what didn't
5 work, and I'm talking to all of you out there now. And
6 this is an opportunity for you to be realistic about
7 what you've done, where you've been and where you need
8 to go. And I urge you to do that.

9 Next question? In the regions?

10 MS. CARON: Nothing yet.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Quiet in the regions.

12 DR. LOMBARDI: Quiet in the regions. Well,
13 they're probably just waking up out there on the West
14 Coast, so we feel you.

15 All right. Well, if there are no further
16 questions we're going to move on to the next section.
17 Thank you. Jacqueline and I will be back to you and
18 with you throughout the day. Thank you very much.

19 DR. JONES: I have a couple of reminders.
20 One is to remind you that it really is okay to raise
21 your hand and interrupt as we're talking. We will --
22 as long as I can see your hand and we can get somebody
23 to get a mic to you, that's fine. You don't have to
24 wait until the end. And also to remind you that in
25 your packets there are -- there's a list of frequently

1 asked questions. The FAQs should be in there, so there
2 may be some things in there that will be helpful to
3 you.

4 So now let's dive into the heart of the
5 application and that is the selection criteria. I'm
6 going to start with criteria (A)(1), and Joan will come
7 back and guide us through (A)(2).

8 (A)(1) provides a place for applicants to
9 highlight their past accomplishments and commitment,
10 and based on that it will build a reform agenda and
11 goals that are articulated in (A)(2). So (A)(1) and
12 (A)(2) are very much tied together.

13 So for selection criteria (A)(1), as you can
14 see it's worth up to 20 points. The idea here is to
15 explain what your state has done to date in early
16 learning and development both to demonstrate the
17 state's track record of commitment and to explain in
18 some detail the starting point, what the starting point
19 looks like in your state; in essence, what does your
20 state's early learning and development landscape look
21 like right now. Many of the other selection criteria
22 take off from where you are today, so explaining your
23 current status clearly is very important. We ask you
24 to describe your state's financial investments in early
25 learning and development over the past five years; how

1 children with high needs have access to programs over
2 the past five years; what legislative and policy
3 landscape looks like; and the current status of your
4 work across all of the building blocks of an early
5 learning and development system.

6 Please note that there are several defined
7 terms in this criterion. The definition of early
8 learning and development program is important to
9 review. This is a very broad definition. It includes
10 all of your early -- all of your child care, state
11 funded preschool, IDEA funded programs and Head Start
12 programs, of course. In D, you'll see that it also
13 includes any non-relative child care provider who
14 regularly cares for two or more unrelated children for
15 a fee in a provider setting.

16 Please note that it may not be appropriate
17 for programs that provide services in a child's home to
18 participate in a quality rating and improvement system.
19 However, such programs are still considered early
20 learning and development programs, since they can
21 participate in other aspects of the state plan.

22 Another important defined term is children with
23 high needs. Please note that certain groups of young
24 children must be considered as children with high needs
25 but that states have the flexibility to identify and

1 include other groups such as large immigrant or
2 minority populations that may deserve special
3 attention. These are children who may require
4 additional support to be successful.

5 Okay. Slide 23. The specific evidence
6 requested for (A)(1), as you may have noticed, is
7 extensive. The list on this slide shows just a few of
8 the requested items. On pages 26 to 38 in the
9 application there's a full list of the evidence for
10 (A)(1). The majority of evidence requested is in the
11 form of background data tables and status tables, and
12 we'll talk a bit more about these in a minute. Note
13 that for two pieces of evidence in (A)(1) we did not
14 provide a table.

15 One is data currently available, if any, on
16 the status of children at kindergarten entry, and
17 that's across the essential domains of school
18 readiness, if available, including data on the
19 readiness gap between children with high needs and
20 their same-age peers. The second is data currently
21 available, if any, on program quality across different
22 types of early learning and development programs. For
23 these you can create your own tables or address the
24 evidence in your narrative response to this criterion,
25 whatever you think will be helpful and most

1 understandable to the reviewers.

2 I'm sure by now you've counted, and you know
3 that there are 13 tables to fill out in (A)(1). Some
4 of these tables are requesting background data to
5 provide context. Others provide specific information
6 on where a state is regarding a particular component
7 area. So the question, why do we have all these
8 tables? We include tables in the application for two
9 major reasons. First, to be very clear with states
10 about what information they need to provide in the
11 application. And second, it's really helpful to
12 reviewers to see this information displayed
13 consistently and clearly across all of the
14 applications. If any of you have reviewed applications
15 you know it's very hard to have to go looking all over
16 the place. If there's a consistent format it is
17 extremely helpful. You will probably also want to
18 provide some explanation of what's in your tables in
19 your narrative section as well.

20 Slide 25. We want to highlight a few of the
21 evidence tables from (A)(1). Here's one that we've
22 already received some questions on. It's Table
23 (A)(1)-4 and it's on pages 30 to 31 of the application.
24 The purpose of this particular table is to provide
25 background data about the state's financial commitment

1 to early learning and development programs over the
2 past five years. An applicant would fill in the table
3 and then discuss the data in the narrative as it
4 relates to responding to the criterion.

5 For fiscal years 2007 to 2010 states should
6 report expenditures. So 2007 to 2010, expenditures.
7 For 2011 states should report appropriations. States
8 should use the bottom row for any explanations that
9 they want to make.

10 For the two items related to the Child Care
11 Development Fund, that's total state contributions to
12 CCDF and state match to CCDF, the state should include
13 any funding that the state counts towards CCDF, state
14 match and maintenance of effort requirements under
15 federal rules, including any local public funding or
16 private donated funding. So you can include local
17 public funding as well as private donated funding.

18 Additionally, states should include CCDF
19 funding for children of all ages including school-age
20 children. States may not have the ability to report
21 funding by age. Therefore, we're asking for total CCDF
22 funding on this table. So if you can't provide it for
23 just children from birth to kindergarten entry, provide
24 it for all children. However, we want you to note that
25 in Table (A)(1)-5 the states are asked to report the

1 number of children from birth to kindergarten entry
2 that participated in programs receiving CCDF funds.

3 Okay. For the items related to TANF spending
4 on early learning and development programs, this amount
5 should include any federal-state TANF spending for
6 child care or early learning and development programs.
7 This includes TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct
8 TANF spending on child care through both assistance and
9 non-assistance. That clear? Okay.

10 Slide 26. Here's an example of another
11 (A)(1) table. This is one that captures the status of
12 where the state is regarding early childhood education
13 workforce credentials. So tables (A)(1)-6 to -13 all
14 request this type of "where you are today" status
15 information, a picture of where you are.

16 And I think we have some more time for
17 questions from the audience, from the regions.

18 MS. CARON: Questions, we got one from the
19 region about the reviewers. It won't be the same five
20 set of the same five reviewers who review all three
21 applications. We're shuffling the reviewers around,
22 and that way it avoids any possibility for systemic
23 bias, so one group is not like a difficult panel or I
24 mean a high-scoring panel or a low-scoring panel. By
25 shuffling them around we avoid that systemic bias.

1 So hopefully that answers your question.

2 That came from Connie in Tennessee.

3 DR. JONES: We have a question.

4 MS. MAXWELL: Hi, I'm Kelly Maxwell.

5 Could you please restate the sentence that
6 you said when you were talking about the definition of
7 early learning and development programs about what may
8 or may not be appropriate to be included in QRIS but
9 could be included in other aspects of this --

10 DR. JONES: I think that's what I said.

11 MS. MAXWELL: Well, but you were talking --

12 DR. JONES: What you just said.

13 MS. MAXWELL: -- I want to hear about -- I
14 want to hear again --

15 DR. JONES: You want to hear exactly what I
16 said.

17 MS. MAXWELL: -- the programs that you were
18 talking about.

19 DR. JONES: Okay. It is a defined -- do you
20 have it, Beth --

21 DR. LOMBARDI: It's a defined term, but I
22 think what we were trying to get at is the home
23 visiting programs that you wouldn't necessarily be
24 including in your QRIS.

25 MS. MAXWELL: So that's what you were talking

1 about, that care provided or programs provided in the
2 child's home? I just wanted to be sure that's what I
3 heard.

4 DR. LOMBARDI: Yes.

5 DR. JONES: That's right. In the child's
6 home.

7 MS. PARK: Jennifer Park from Florida. Over
8 here. Sorry.

9 Is it the intention to not place priority on
10 school-age services?

11 DR. JONES: That is not the intention. When
12 we say all programs we really mean all programs.

13 MS. PARK: But is the priority on the birth
14 to five?

15 DR. JONES: It is all programs across the
16 birth to kindergarten entry age range, and they can be
17 in private providers, in Head Start, in child care, in
18 school-based programs. We really do mean all.

19 MS. PARK: Okay.

20 DR. JONES: Pardon?

21 MS. MILLER: Me, right? I'm Carol Miller
22 from Minnesota, and thank you for addressing the Child
23 Care Development Fund issue about age because that's a
24 concern to us.

25 You did -- could you go back? I was writing

1 really fast. You did say there was one place where we
2 did need to identify age, and I wasn't clear where you
3 were referring to that.

4 DR. JONES: I think there's another table
5 where you will have -- you will be able to list how
6 many children are in those programs, and I will get to
7 that page right away.

8 DR. LOMBARDI: The question that had come in
9 previously was -- can you hear?

10 DR. JONES: Um-hum.

11 DR. LOMBARDI: Okay. The question that had
12 come in previously, and Shannon is joining us now, was,
13 you know, could they include in one of those charts the
14 school-age children, and the answer was yes. And I
15 don't know if you want to --

16 DR. JONES: Yes, and that was a question we
17 had, and I appreciate that answer.

18 MS. MILLER: So here's --

19 DR. LOMBARDI: Let me just repeat --

20 DR. JONES: So you'll be able to answer. So
21 it's in Table (A)(1)-5, Table (A)(1)-5, states are
22 asked to report the number of children from birth to
23 kindergarten entry that participate in programs
24 receiving CCDF funds.

25 MS. MILLER: Then could I finish my question?

1 We don't track statewide the age of the child using
2 CCDF funds. We would need to estimate it.

3 MS. RUDISILL: So can I --

4 DR. JONES: Shannon.

5 MS. RUDISILL: So I think that there's -- a
6 way to talk about this is there's two things we're
7 talking about here. We're talking about basically
8 caseload enrollment of children, right? And I think
9 that's (A)(1)-5. And then we're talking about the
10 money. Now in terms of -- and how much money you
11 devote to those kids, right?

12 So for CCDF we generally never ask you to
13 report to us what proportion of your money goes to kids
14 at various ages. And so here we're not asking you to
15 do that. That's not data we're sure that you would
16 have access to. It's not something you report to the
17 Office of Child Care. That's why we say give us your
18 total CCDF, birth to 13, for the money.

19 For the caseload, you report that to us. I
20 could -- I mean I -- we have it. It's on our website.
21 You know, you report to us each child and their birth
22 date -- I believe it's by birth date -- and how old
23 they are. So you have that data on the kids in CCDF by
24 age. So for the table that has to do with just the
25 children enrolled, that we thought you could bring to

1 zero to five. You know, and on the CCDF contributions,
2 the amount of money, that was the one where we really
3 felt like you wouldn't have it.

4 We also don't want to imply that for CCDF we
5 are expecting states -- states can do what they want.
6 You can decide how much money you want to devote across
7 zero to 13 spectrum, but we didn't want to imply that
8 we expect states to be -- we don't expect, from the
9 federal perspective, states to be shifting money out of
10 the school-age population into the early learning
11 population. It's your choice how you spend that money.
12 You could do what you like but we, you know, we felt
13 like we didn't want to make that distinction in that
14 table on the money.

15 MS. MILLER: Thank you. That clarification
16 really helps.

17 MS. RUDISILL: Is that -- okay. You -- okay.

18 And there was another similar one that came
19 in from a region so Beth's -- okay.

20 So there was a question. Hold on. I didn't
21 see where it was from.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You talking about the
23 federally-funded one locally or is it --

24 MS. RUDISILL: Okay. So this question about
25 local match I'm not -- came up again. And so -- and

1 local funding and the Table (A)(1) for the money table.
2 So in the money table (A)(1)-4 where it -- it's
3 generally talking about state contributions, and we
4 mean state money in those parts. There is an exception
5 though because for CCDF, those of you who are familiar
6 with CCDF policy know that you can use other sources
7 for your match. You could use local. You can use
8 private donated within some, you know, regulatory
9 constraints. So we wanted to be sure -- we didn't want
10 you to have to back out those parts of your match and
11 only put in that slot the part of your match that was
12 the state funding. We, you know, you want to be able
13 to say here's what we used -- here's our match. Here's
14 how much it is. Here's whether or not it is less than
15 the total match, you know, whether we draw it all down
16 or not or whether we exceed. And then put a footnote
17 saying what the sources are is what suggested that you
18 do.

19 I hope that helps because that came up
20 several times and is apparently still coming up today.

21 DR. JONES: There's another -- do you have a
22 question?

23 MS. RAMSEY: Right here. Bridget Ramsey,
24 Kentucky.

25 With respect to the same issue that we're

1 talking about, the CCDF funds and the local private
2 investment, so if that's not part of the state match,
3 but it's clearly being invested at the local level to
4 increase quality, is that something that can be
5 included in this table?

6 MS. CARON: That's what you -- yeah.

7 You can modify these tables in any way that
8 you think makes sense. You won't obviously delete the
9 things we've asked you to put in there, but you can
10 additional rows. You can add information in your
11 narrative. You can describe. Just make sure that it's
12 clear to the reviewers what you're conveying so that
13 they can look at it appropriately.

14 MS. RAMSEY: Right. Thank you.

15 MS. CARON: And before we move to our next
16 one, we also got one from Christine in New York about
17 the expenditures versus appropriations, and this is one
18 that Jacqueline spoke to briefly. But in describing
19 the state's funding commitment, should you base your
20 values on appropriations for particular programs or for
21 actual expenditures? And we're expecting that it will
22 be on expenditures in the prior years and probably on
23 appropriations for '11 so --

24 Question over here? Yeah.

25 MR. HAGGARD: Dan Haggard from New Mexico.

1 I certainly understand the importance of the
2 states describing their state's contributions and state
3 commitment, but I'm wondering where and if it would be
4 appropriate, and I think you might have just answered
5 this, because in New Mexico, for example, federally
6 funded Head Start and other federally funded programs
7 are a really critical and important part of our system.
8 So where should we or should we indicate that in terms
9 of describing the big picture of what our system looks
10 like and our commitment to providing those funds and
11 programs for children?

12 DR. LOMBARDI: I think we have it on the
13 number of children served, but I think that your
14 question is about the funding amounts in -- of the
15 federal Head Start expenditures in your state. And
16 it's --

17 MR. HAGGARD: In the narrative as well as in
18 the budget.

19 DR. JONES: Do it in the narrative.

20 MR. HAGGARD: How do we describe what our --
21 the --

22 DR. LOMBARDI: Well, you know, certainly
23 since those children are served in the state you'd want
24 to talk about them in your narrative. In (A)(1)-5 it
25 says early Head Start and Head Start funded enrollment.

1 But I think he's asking about the funding --

2 DR. JONES: The money. The money. And that
3 certainly could be --

4 DR. LOMBARDI: We'll come back to you.

5 MS. RUDISILL: -- you can add rows if you
6 want to show anything. Add a row.

7 DR. LOMBARDI: Yeah. But I want to be
8 explicit about it, so we'll come back to you and
9 clarify that, okay?

10 DR. JONES: That's a good -- that's a very
11 good question.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're looking at
13 2011, and he's talking about the funding for Head
14 Start. But when we're looking at appropriations around
15 the enrollment and trying to determine that, that is
16 something that we'd like clarified.

17 DR. LOMBARDI: Okay. We're going to clarify
18 the Head Start expenditure issue and other and whether
19 in doing that we talk about what's planned for FY '11.
20 Okay. We'll come back to you with that.

21 MS. CARON: But just a note about the federal
22 dollars. We know what the federal dollars are that are
23 going out to states, so this is really about your state
24 painting your state picture, so that's really why we've
25 set it up the way we have, so the focus is on the

1 state.

2 MS. RUDISILL: Well, it's -- and we have a
3 question coming up. We have a question from the
4 region. We have a question from Paul in Oklahoma.
5 Where should we include tribal CCDF grants in Table
6 (A)(1)-4, so the answer is if the state so chooses you
7 could add a row. If you are reaching out to your tribe
8 service -- this grant you add a row on the table, and
9 you could include your tribal contributions there.

10 DR. LOMBARDI: You know, I want to just
11 reiterate how important these questions are because you
12 do want to get the total picture, and I think that's
13 the intent here is the total picture of the children
14 and the places they're being served. So I think
15 they're good questions, and I think the guiding
16 principle is trying to give the total picture.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there a question in
18 this row? Oh, sorry.

19 JILLIAN: Hi, I'm Jillian from Wyoming, and I
20 have a good segue question.

21 In terms of adding rows, can we also delete
22 rows if we're not using them, and can we delete
23 instructions like that are gray where it says a note, a
24 grand total, etc.?

25 MS. CARON: You can delete instructions to

1 make your chart simpler or -- but you can't delete the
2 rows that we're asking for. The rows that are in there
3 now are the rows that we're asking for information on
4 and that the reviewers will be looking for.

5 JILLIAN: Okay.

6 MS. CARON: If you don't have data to put in
7 that row, leave it blank. Explain that in your
8 narrative. Talk about it. But don't delete the rows
9 of things that we've asked for.

10 JILLIAN: Okay. But any text that is
11 instructional may be deleted?

12 MS. CARON: If you're trying to shorten it up
13 somehow and you want to delete that, but it's probably
14 not a bad idea to leave that in there, too, because it
15 might be helpful to the reviewers as well so --

16 JILLIAN: Okay. Thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is your reference
18 federal fiscal year or state fiscal year?

19 MS. CARON: Which reference --

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In the funding table.

21 MS. CARON: This is state. It's state. It's
22 what's happening in your state.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So we use our state
24 fiscal year?

25 MS. CARON: Yes.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. And can I ask
2 one more question? In the -- in (A)(1)-5 where we talk
3 about the children with high needs, in our pre-K
4 program we are not asking families for income data. So
5 we, you know, we have a total number of pre-K kids
6 served. We know about kids with disabilities or
7 identified things. We don't have income data on those
8 kids. Should we be estimating that as part of the
9 high-needs population, and is there a particular
10 measure you'd like us to use like school lunch or -- so
11 that's just my question.

12 DR. JONES: If you -- whatever data you have
13 it's, you know, we're looking for whatever you can give
14 us to let us know what the population looks like. So
15 if you have school lunch, free and reduced lunch, if
16 you have low income data, that's what you would
17 provide, whatever you have.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So we should estimate
19 what part of the population might be low income based
20 on a universal program?

21 MS. CARON: And if you -- make sure you put
22 in your footnotes so that you explain for the reviewer
23 this is what we did; this is estimated; this is how we
24 estimated; your methodology, you know.

25 DR. JONES: Exactly. Yeah.

1 MS. CARON: Or this is a subpopulation that
2 looks like this. Just describe it all so that the
3 reviewers know what they're looking at.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

5 MS. CARON: And while we're waiting for the
6 microphone to get handed off, we got two from the
7 regions. This is from Christie (phonetic) in Oregon.
8 Do we want the entire high-quality plan in the
9 application, and where should it go?

10 And the question is yes, we want you to put
11 in your entire high-quality plan. That's what we're
12 going to be -- that reviewers are going to be looking
13 at, what we're going to be expecting to see in there.
14 So you put them in your responses with each of the
15 criterion that it's related to so --

16 We also have one here and we have one --
17 okay. Go ahead.

18 MS. GRACE: Cathy Grace, Mississippi.

19 The tables that currently we're discussing
20 seem to be around the program, the children served. If
21 we create our own table list, I think maybe Joan
22 referenced, about investments in quality that state
23 dollars have paid for, is that an appropriate place to
24 actually construct a table, since these tables seem
25 more about numbers of children served versus the

1 investment made in the quality of those programs?

2 MS. CARON: I think that's your decision.
3 You basically -- again, you're painting a picture for
4 the reviewers. You're showing them what it looks like,
5 so you decide where the best place for that kind of
6 information would be.

7 MS. KELLEY: Liz Kelley, Maryland.
8 My question is about the narrative. You're
9 referring to including a lot of information in the
10 narrative. Throughout the plan there are recommended
11 limits on the amount that a state can write. Are those
12 simply that, recommendations, or are states encouraged
13 to not exceed those limits or those recommended --

14 MS. CARON: Those were our best guesses at
15 what we thought. Obviously they're going to vary. The
16 idea behind the page limits is to give you some sense
17 of try to, you know, try to cull it where you can and
18 be brief where you can, the idea being reviewers
19 appreciate, you know, something that they can handle.

20 MS. KELLEY: Having been a reviewer I
21 appreciate it, too, but -- so we won't be penalized
22 should we go over that?

23 MS. CARON: No, you will not be penalized.
24 Those are recommendations. You can go beyond those
25 recommendations. Just keep in mind who's reading these

1 and how many they're reading and --

2 And we have one more that came in on the
3 mailbox, and this is about whether or not the
4 governor's office can be the lead agency. And the lead
5 agency needs to be one of the participating state
6 agencies that are defined in the list, so the
7 governor's office would not be able to be a lead
8 agency. [Note: further clarification was provided on p.
9 139 to explain that the Governor's Office can be a lead
10 agency if it meets the definition of a Participating
11 State Agency].

12 MS. MATHIAS: Deb Mathias from Pennsylvania.
13 Back to page limits, one of the things we were asked to
14 attach was the core body of knowledge, and ours is like
15 70 or 80 pages long. And when I'm looking at 150-page
16 guideline on the appendices part, I'm thinking wow, we
17 haven't even attached the star standards or other
18 things. So just any advice you have about that part of
19 it.

20 MS. CARON: Right. And the appendices -- you
21 can make the appendices as big as they need to be to
22 capture what you need to capture. So if you have
23 something that's a big document like that, you put it
24 in there, make reference to it in your narrative. Tell
25 people what they need to know in the narrative about it

1 so that they don't have to be expected to read all of
2 that, but then they have it at their disposal that they
3 can flip through and see.

4 DR. JONES: Okay. Joan is going to guide us
5 through (A)(2).

6 DR. LOMBARDI: So before I go on to (A)(2), I
7 just want to make one other comment about the (A)(1)
8 section. You know, for years we've been trying to get
9 our data all together. This is an opportunity to do
10 that. We know it won't be perfect. We know we're, you
11 know, in various places across the country in our
12 ability to do that. But this is an enormous
13 opportunity. I know it's daunting. But it's an
14 enormous opportunity for us to finally put a map on the
15 table of what we're currently doing, and I hope you go
16 into this with that spirit and that sense of excitement
17 about trying to finally document it.

18 So let me walk through briefly criterion
19 (A)(2) before opening it up again for questions. This
20 criterion is about articulating your reform agenda and
21 goals and your answers to (A)(2) will build on the
22 data -- sorry. Should have moved that. That will
23 build on the data and narrative in (A)(1).

24 So this is not disconnected from (A)(1).
25 This is the natural place to go once you say okay,

1 here's our map of what we're doing. Now we're going to
2 tell you where we want to go. And that's what (A)(2)
3 is really all about. Your answers again to (A)(2) will
4 build on the data and the narrative that you created in
5 (A)(1).

6 This is the criteria where you lay out the
7 overall argument or theory of change for your
8 application. What are you planning to do? Why is this
9 the right list for your state? And what difference
10 will this make for the children with high needs in your
11 state? That's the core, right, of why you're going
12 down this path. The sub-criteria (a) asks you for your
13 goals.

14 (b) asks you to summarize what you're doing,
15 you're going to do across all the plans in your
16 application and why these constitute an effective and
17 feasible reform agenda. So what this -- why this
18 particular reform agenda for your particular state.

19 (c) asks you to provide the rationale for
20 which criteria you choose to address in the focused
21 investment areas.

22 I'm going backwards. Okay.

23 Here's the specific evidence requested for
24 (A)(2), so you remember in each section you're -- we're
25 asking for specific evidence. Note that the state is

1 asked to develop goals around specific areas, so your
2 goals are not just generic. They're specific to each
3 area. Note, too, that there should be direct linkages
4 between the data tables in (A)(1), particularly -6 to
5 -13, and your decisions about which criteria to address
6 in the focused investment areas (C), (D) and (E). So
7 there needs to be a rationale between where you are now
8 and where you want to go, and those should be
9 articulated.

10 Under (A)(2) in the application there are
11 checkboxes, as you know, provided where you'll
12 indicated which criteria under focused investment areas
13 (C), (D) and (E) you're addressing. Here is the
14 checkbox for focused investment area (C). So you'll
15 need to decide and check the box, pretty
16 straightforward, which ones -- which particular parts
17 of that focused area you're going to focus on.

18 Remember states must address all criteria in
19 the core areas (A) and (B). But you have flexibility
20 about how many and which criteria to address in the
21 focused investment areas. In Section (C) you have to
22 address at least two criteria, but you could address
23 more. In Sections (D) and (E) you have to address at
24 least one criteria in each section, at least one in (D)
25 and one in (E), but you can address more. In these

1 focused investment areas the points are spread evenly
2 across the criteria that the state chooses to address
3 so that states are not advantaged or disadvantaged in
4 the competition based on the number of criteria they
5 choose to address. And there may be questions about
6 that, but I want to be clear about that. The number of
7 points in the chart for that section will tell you what
8 the overall points are, and they're spread over the
9 number of criteria that you choose. And we can come
10 back to that if you need further clarification.

11 Again, we moved to do this in Sections (C),
12 (D) and (E) to give you more flexibility and to have
13 your plan fit your particular needs in your state.

14 So before I turn it over to Ngozi, I want to
15 see if there's any questions, further questions,
16 clarification --

17 MS. CARON: And while you queue up the
18 questions for Joan, we got one from Chris in Oregon
19 whether you could -- some of the evidence that we're
20 asking for is rather lengthy, and so she wanted to know
21 if you could add that in wherever you wanted it in the
22 document. Could you insert a section for the evidence
23 right there in that section?

24 And it's up to you again to decide what you
25 think makes the most sense for the readers, whether you

1 want to point them to something somewhere else and
2 reference it or whether you want to put it right there
3 where it occurs. That's up to you, and you have the
4 flexibility to do that.

5 DR. LOMBARDI: Okay. Ngozi Onunaku, turn it
6 over to you.

7 MS. CARON: We got the question yet of where
8 the restrooms are?

9 If you're looking for them outside, the
10 women's rooms are on this side of the building, and the
11 men's rooms are on that side. I won't do left and
12 right because I get it wrong, and it's different for
13 you guys than it is for me.

14 MS. ONUNAKU: Okay. So now we're going to
15 talk about organizing people and resources. So we're
16 going to start with walking through the criterion under
17 (A)(3). This is the criterion that deals with aligning
18 and coordinating early learning and development across
19 the state. So this criterion is about how all of the
20 different agencies in the state will work together.

21 In sub-criterion (a) here we ask you to
22 describe the governance structure. So we want to know
23 the organizational structure. We want to know the
24 roles and responsibilities, how decisions will be made
25 and finally how stakeholders will participate and be

1 involved in planning and implementation. We received
2 some questions about who should be involved and who is
3 required in planning and implementation, and we'll get
4 into that in just a little bit.

5 For now, let's draw your attention to some of
6 the defined terms here that we used. So it's -- lead
7 agency here is sort of magnified here in the purple, or
8 it may be pink in your handouts, and the definition is
9 also spelled out in page 17 of your application. So in
10 the definition we explain that the lead agency is the
11 fiscal agent for the grant and that it may have other
12 roles as defined by the state. And it is one of the
13 required participating state agencies, and we'll just
14 go through what a participating state agency is in just
15 a second.

16 Okay. We also received several questions,
17 again getting back to which agencies are participating
18 agencies, which ones are required, which ones aren't.
19 So here we've magnified the definition of participating
20 state agency. You'll see that we've pulled out and
21 have explained which ones are required. So for example
22 here, you'll see that the agencies that supervise or
23 oversee the Child Care and Development Fund, for
24 example, the Section 619 of Part B and Part C of IDEA
25 and also the state advisory council. Those are just to

1 give you some examples, but you'll have to read the
2 full participating state agency definition to get a
3 sense of all of the ones that are required. So you can
4 read the full list for yourself.

5 Also the list includes agencies of the state
6 that may elect to participate in this process. So a
7 state can use its discretion to also include, for
8 example, as is included here, the child welfare agency,
9 the TANF agency, the mental health and so on and so
10 forth. Again, the full list is here and in your
11 application.

12 Getting back to the question, the numerous
13 questions we received about which other entities and
14 stakeholders should participate or be required to
15 participate, so just to give you a flavor of some of
16 the questions that we got, one question had to do with
17 are tribal entities required as part of the
18 participating state agencies list? Are state boards of
19 education required? Are representatives or families
20 representing ELL, so English language learners,
21 homeless children, migrant children, foster care,
22 tribal children, so wanting to -- the question had to
23 do with are these representatives or entities that
24 represent these interests also required?

25 So these groups can be a part of this

1 process, but they are not required. So we leave this
2 up to you to look at your demographics and the needs of
3 your state in order to determine which stakeholders
4 should be included and what their level of involvement
5 should be. Again, this is going beyond these required
6 state agencies that -- the participating state
7 agencies.

8 Also I just want to draw your attention to
9 the FAQ document that Jacqueline referenced earlier, so
10 we have an FAQ on that on page 5 of the FAQ document.
11 It's under A-9, and that gives you a sense of the other
12 entities that may be involved -- again, it's up to the
13 state's discretion -- and what their possible roles
14 could be if you determine so.

15 Okay. So now we're moving on to sub-
16 criterion (b) and here we want applicants to
17 demonstrate that the participating state agencies are
18 committed to the plan, its governance structure and
19 effective implementation. So those are the three areas
20 that we are really focusing in on under sub-criterion
21 (b).

22 So in order to demonstrate this, each
23 participating state agency must complete a memorandum
24 of understanding, or an MOU is how we'll refer to it
25 here on out, or another binding agreement. To help you

1 in developing your MOUs, we've included in the
2 application a sample template that you can use, so
3 that's going to be found in your application on pages
4 101 to 103 so take a look at the sample template, and
5 you can feel free to adapt it and modify it as you
6 wish.

7 We received a few questions about what
8 happens if an agency that's responsible for multiple
9 programs or functions and whether multiple MOUs will be
10 required, so now is a good time to make that very
11 clear. We even got a really humorous question about if
12 you're in this predicament would you sign MOUs with
13 yourself? So you know, we appreciate the humor. We
14 can take a joke.

15 So I just want to be clear that an MOU is
16 required for each participating state agency, and it
17 has to delineate its individual role that each agency
18 will play. So if you're in a situation where an agency
19 has multiple roles to play or has these multiple
20 programs, an MOU must be developed between the
21 participating agency and the lead agency. So yes,
22 multiple MOUs will be required. [NOTE: This discussion
23 continues on pp 54-56].

24 I'm sorry. Is there a question?

25 MS. CARON: That's not clear to folks?

1 (Attendees indicate no.)

2 MS. CARON: Okay. So in other words, if
3 your -- if you have a state agency that's the lead
4 agency, and it also is one of the -- has one of the
5 same roles as one of the other participating state
6 agencies, and it's also the one that has the state
7 advisory council as part of its role, than the state
8 advisory council will have certain activities that it's
9 responsible for. Those are delineated in an MOU and in
10 the statement of work. And then the lead agency is
11 also the one who's facilitating the entire program, so
12 you'll need to have some representative of each of
13 those bodies signing an MOU. So technically it looks
14 like an MOU with yourself. I mean that's --

15 MS. ONUNAKU: Yes.

16 MS. CARON: -- technically what it looks
17 like, but it's an MOU between two bodies in the same
18 agency basically. So it's the state advisory council
19 in this case and the lead agency. So there will be
20 cases where one agency has MOUs within that agency with
21 parts of it that are doing different parts of the plan.

22 Does that make sense, or is that even worse?

23 That's even worse. Okay.

24 MS. ONUNAKU: I don't think your microphone
25 is on.

1 MR. FURR: Hi. Jon Furr from the state of
2 Illinois. So just to clarify, if the lead agency is in
3 our agency the state education agency, and they also
4 administer Part C or one of the programs you're saying
5 that the state education agency signs an agreement with
6 itself for a scope of work? I think that we're
7 confused about --

8 MS. CARON: No. Ngozi, why don't you go back
9 to the slide that has the participating agencies on it.

10 MS. ONUNAKU: Um-hum.

11 MS. CARON: So this -- if you look at this
12 you'll see that there's a state agency that administers
13 CCDF, and there's a state agency that administers IDEA.
14 It might be the same agency that administers both of
15 those programs, but you're going to have activities
16 that you're going to want each program lead to be
17 engaged in. So you will actually be writing an MOU
18 that says here's what the Part C folks will be doing.

19 MR. FURR: Correct.

20 MS. CARON: Here's what the CCDF folks will
21 be doing if that -- or here's what the lead agency is
22 doing. So between CCDF and the lead agency you'll be
23 writing an MOU. Between --

24 MR. FURR: Well, just to clarify on that
25 point, for the scope of work I guess the assumptions

1 that we had was that the scope of work would describe
2 for each agency what their scope components would be.
3 There would be one signatory for that agency, the chief
4 executive, so you would not have the program
5 administrator for Part B to be signing the MOU on
6 behalf of the Part B Program within the state education
7 agency?

8 MS. CARON: That's exactly right.

9 MS. ONUNAKU: That's right.

10 MR. FURR: It would be the chief -- okay.

11 MS. CARON: Yes, so --

12 MS. ONUNAKU: And I think there's another
13 question.

14 DR. LOMBARDI: I want to be very, very clear
15 about that. So if one agency has multiple programs is
16 what you're asking for. You can put the information
17 about those programs in the MOU, right, into one. Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. The state
19 advisory council --

20 DR. LOMBARDI: Yes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But if the lead agency
22 is also that agency, it is essentially an MOU with
23 yourself?

24 MS. CARON: Right. Well, yeah --

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In that case?

1 MS. CARON: Yeah. Right.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay --

3 MS. JONAS: Excuse me. Deborah Jonas from
4 Virginia. I just want --

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where are you?

6 MS. JONAS: Back here.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thanks.

8 MS. JONAS: I just want to clarify, I mean
9 our agency is responsible for several of these
10 programs. We're not going to have an MOU with our
11 self. Our procurement office won't let that happen.
12 In our agreements with the other participating
13 agencies, would it be acceptable because that -- what
14 you just described is not going to go through our
15 agency, and I suspect a lot of us are in the same boat.
16 You delineate very specifically, in our case, the
17 Virginia Department of Education has the following
18 responsibilities, and you list them out.

19 DR. LOMBARDI: Yes, yes.

20 MS. JONAS: So for Part B and C of IDEA and
21 state funded preschool and Title I of ESEA, in our
22 agreement with the Virginia Department of Social
23 Services we would delineate our responsibilities and
24 their responsibilities which also hits several of those
25 programs.

1 DR. LOMBARDI: Exactly.

2 MS. JONAS: But it's one agreement --

3 DR. LOMBARDI: Yes.

4 MS. JONAS: -- between us and DSS, and then
5 we would reiterate our responsibilities, for example,
6 in an agreement with the Department of Health which are
7 essentially the same as in DSS. So there we could
8 perhaps have two agreements for three agencies. Does
9 that -- and in each one the agency's responsibilities
10 are explicit and speak to this. But it's not an MOU
11 with yourself. It's part of your master agreement our
12 chief signs and their chief signs, and all the
13 responsibilities for that agency is what the chief is
14 signing for.

15 DR. LOMBARDI: And I think the goal here is
16 to delineate who is doing what.

17 MS. ONUNAKU: That's right.

18 DR. LOMBARDI: I mean that -- we have to keep
19 coming back to those goals and it sounds like --

20 MS. JONAS: And I have one other question on
21 that because I heard one of you say that the program
22 directors would need to sign. Is that correct or is
23 that incorrect?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, they do not.

25 DR. LOMBARDI: No.

1 MS. JONAS: So just the agency chief --

2 DR. LOMBARDI: That's right.

3 MS. JONAS: -- with the specific
4 responsibilities affiliated with those programs and
5 anything you write in agreeing --

6 DR. LOMBARDI: And obviously the program --

7 MS. JONAS: -- that this is what we're going
8 to do?

9 DR. LOMBARDI: -- the program director would
10 want to -- need to know what they're going to do..

11 MS. JONAS: And also I mean we may be
12 reorganizing within the work of the grant. So having a
13 program director who may or may not exist in three
14 years as even a position, if we're actually going to
15 reorganize and streamline, wouldn't make a lot of
16 sense. So you basically if you had two -- each agency
17 head signs or designee signs an agreement, and all the
18 responsibilities in each agency are laid out?

19 DR. LOMBARDI: The MOUs are across the
20 agencies. I mean I think that's the bottom line.

21 MS. ONUNAKU: So again to Joan's point and
22 Beth's point, the real goal here is to make really
23 clear what each agency, each participating state agency
24 is doing. As you can imagine this could become a very
25 unmanageable process if everyone is at the table and

1 the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is
2 doing. So that's the spirit of it.

3 The second point that I just wanted to make
4 to the last person that had raised the question about
5 how things may change, and I'll just make a remark
6 about that in a second, is that after you submit the
7 MOU for your application we recognize that things may
8 change in the state, and so there will be a timeframe
9 for you to make some modifications, you know, if some
10 roles change or if you get a little bit more clear on
11 the scope of work. So I'll just make a comment about
12 that in a second, but I just want to take this question
13 before moving on.

14 MS. MINZENBERG: Okay. Barb Minzenberg from
15 Pennsylvania.

16 We are working currently with participating
17 state agencies, of course, and we are proposing in our
18 application to work with additional state agencies.
19 Are our MOUs to address the current work as well as the
20 prospective work or just the proposed work?

21 MS. ONUNAKU: It's to address the proposed
22 work to be done and then, as I said that I'm going to
23 remark on in just a second, you -- when it seems that
24 you need to make some modifications because some things
25 have shifted, and it makes sense to be a little bit

1 more clear about what the scope of work is. Once a
2 state has been awarded then there's a timeframe to do
3 that and to make those modifications.

4 Does that answer your question? [Note: This
5 answer was clarified by p.62 lines 9-15].

6 MS. MINZENBERG: Okay. Well, the reason I'm
7 asking it is you're talking about required MOUs from
8 each of the participating agencies.

9 MS. ONUNAKU: That's right.

10 MS. MINZENBERG: So we're not proposing new
11 work with each of those agencies.

12 MS. ONUNAKU: It's -- what you're proposing
13 is what you've developed as a team together in your
14 state plan. So you've got -- I'm just making this up,
15 but you've got five agencies that are coming together
16 as participating state agencies. You've delineated
17 each of the five roles. You're going to -- in your
18 application you would talk about what that proposal is,
19 and let's say you get awarded, and now you've had an
20 opportunity to think things through a little bit, and
21 you want to make some modifications, there's an
22 opportunity to do that. [Note: clarification on pp. 62-
23 63 explains that States will have 90 days to finalize
24 their scopes of work rather than to modify plans].

25 MS. MINZENBERG: All right.

1 MS. ONUNAKU: Does that answer the question?

2 MS. MINZENBERG: Well, our proposed work
3 is -- does not involve all of these agencies because
4 we've already got ongoing work in fact with most of
5 them.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. And that's --

7 MS. ONUNAKU: When you say proposed work, are
8 you talking about the work of your plan?

9 MS. MINZENBERG: Our new work in our plan.

10 MS. ONUNAKU: What you're proposing in your
11 Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge application?

12 MS. MINZENBERG: Yes.

13 MS. ONUNAKU: And it does not include all of
14 these --

15 MS. MINZENBERG: Right, because we already
16 have ongoing work with --

17 MS. ONUNAKU: So can you just make a rough --

18 MS. CARON: So they are included then? I
19 mean if you have ongoing work then they're included in
20 an ongoing --

21 MS. MINZENBERG: It will continue.

22 MS. CARON: -- way but they need -- all of
23 these people need to be included in your plan.

24 MS. MINZENBERG: Okay.

25 MS. CARON: So anyone that's a participating

1 agency is a required participating agency that must be
2 part of your plan.

3 MS. MINZENBERG: And --

4 MS. WEISS: Can I restate this question and
5 the answer because I think we're getting confused. So
6 your question was should MOUs address current work or
7 only proposed work?

8 MS. MINZENBERG: Correct.

9 MS. WEISS: The answer is the MOUs should
10 address all the work that's in your application. So if
11 your application is talking about current work, that
12 should be in the MOU. The MOU is not only new stuff.
13 It's everything you're doing under this application
14 which means even existing things happening across each
15 of these agencies has to be covered in the MOU and in
16 the application.

17 MS. MINZENBERG: That's perfect. Thank you.

18 MR. FURR: Hi, this is Jon Furr from the
19 state of Illinois just with a follow-up.

20 With the model that's in the application, the
21 MOU seems to assume that there would be separate
22 agreements with the lead agency and each of the
23 participating agencies. Could we have a master
24 agreement that has the lead agency and just has
25 separate scopes of work for all the participating

1 agencies?

2 MS. CARON: Yeah, that's up to your state.
3 You decide how you want to make that look. Just make
4 it clear.

5 And then just to clarify the window that you
6 have to do modifications is really a 90-day window
7 after your grant is awarded that you can finalize the
8 scopes of work that are in your MOU that are attached
9 to that, and it's really to finalize those. So you
10 have that window for that purpose.

11 MS. MATHIAS: Hi. Deb Mathias, Pennsylvania.
12 Let's just say --

13 MS. ONUNAKU: Wait. One more. On the
14 modifications, the other thing that you might want to
15 do is look at I-3 in the FAQs because I mean you can
16 make adjustments, but you also will always have to be
17 careful to not be modifying the scope of your
18 application that ends up getting approved. And there's
19 a little bit more detail in that FAQ that you should
20 refer yourself to.

21 DR. JONES: There was another question?

22 MS. MATHIAS: Let's just say that the office
23 administers the CCDF, Part B and C of IDEA, state
24 funded preschool, home visiting, Head State Collab and
25 the child care development block grant. Are you saying

1 that the director of the office would sign between
2 herself MOUs for all of that work that she oversees?

3 MS. ONUNAKU: Beth, I'm going to let you
4 answer the question. Did you --

5 MS. CARON: Sorry, I'm distracted.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Here, I can answer it.
7 So no, one agency can sign an MOU and if that agency
8 administers multiple programs or does multiple things,
9 that will be covered within the body of the MOU in
10 terms of the scope of work that that particular agency
11 is responsible for. The case becomes bizarre perhaps
12 when the lead agency is also the head of the state
13 advisory council because those two -- in each of those
14 capacities the same person could be signing an MOU with
15 himself or herself, one with each hat on, but in
16 general one agency, even if it administers multiple
17 programs, just has to sign one MOU that lists all the
18 different activities and responsibilities that it has
19 because of all the different programs it administers.
20 And you'll see there's a scope of work exhibit where
21 you will lay all of this information out. And that is
22 the scope of work exhibit I think that Ngozi was
23 referring to in saying that if you win a grant you'll
24 have 90 days to flesh that out in even greater detail.
25 It's not so much about modification as it is about

1 going into more detail that you don't have to provide
2 at this level of the application but you will have to
3 provide if you win a grant.

4 DR. LOMBARDI: You know, again, and I want to
5 keep coming back to kind of thinking in a, you know,
6 common sense way that the goal here is to delineate
7 responsibilities and to be clear about it. You know, I
8 have multiple programs that I administer. It's very
9 important with underneath that they understand what
10 each other's going to do.

11 MS. ONUNAKU: Okay. Another question?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A simple question,
13 mechanical. The MOU itself, can it -- can we put those
14 in through the appendix and reference, or do you want
15 them imbedded in the narrative?

16 MS. ONUNAKU: Yes, you can, and then just
17 make sure that you make a reference so that the
18 reviewers can find it easily.

19 Okay. All right. Good discussion. It's
20 good to know it now because you have to be writing.

21 Okay. So one other thing that I really want
22 to emphasize to you about the -- oh, let's move back,
23 forward. Sorry. Give me a second. Okay. Just want
24 to make sure we covered everything. Okay. All right.

25 So moving on to -- there is one more point

1 that we wanted to make about the MOUs. So in addition
2 to all that we've discussed, MOUs, the states are going
3 to be -- applicants will be required that everyone who
4 is signing on to this MOU that there's an agreement
5 there's -- that there's going to be a common, statewide
6 set of early learning standards, early learning and
7 development standards, program standards, a tiered
8 QRIS, and workforce knowledge and competency framework
9 and progression of credentials. So there has to be an
10 agreement.

11 If in your MOUs the participating state
12 agencies do not agree to use common standards and
13 systems, the list that I just went through, the
14 application will be removed from the competition. So
15 we just want to emphasize, I'll just say it again just
16 to make sure that everybody's on one page, in addition
17 to making sure that the participating agency is
18 developing an MOU with the lead agency the MOU that's
19 executed must include an agreement to use a common,
20 statewide set of early learning and development
21 standards, program standards, tiered QRIS and workforce
22 knowledge and competency framework and progression of
23 credentials.

24 So before I move on to the next slide I just
25 want to stop and see if there are any questions from

1 the regions or from you all here. So there's a
2 question in the back.

3 MS. SUTTER: Hi. Jessica Sutter from D.C.
4 again.

5 It says to the extent applicable, and I'm
6 imagining general counsels of various agencies looking
7 at MOUs and saying the Department of Mental Health has
8 no business being involved in quality rating and
9 improvement system for providers. So is it possible to
10 include language in the MOU that says we acknowledge
11 that these are used in the state; however, our agency
12 doesn't play a part in such things?

13 MS. ONUNAKU: And that's why that phrase is
14 included, to the extent applicable or possible. So if
15 it's -- the burden is on you, the state, to justify or
16 explain why this is not applicable in your state.
17 But -- or your -- sorry, your --

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: To that agency.

19 MS. ONUNAKU: Yeah, to the agency.

20 MS. SUTTER: Great. Thank you.

21 MS. ONUNAKU: Yeah. So you got to make the
22 case.

23 Anyone else?

24 Okay. Good.

25 Okay. So we're going to move on to slide 38.

1 And here we're just trying to pull it out for -- it's
2 actually for us so that we can find it pretty easy. So
3 on page 92 of your application we ask -- one component
4 of the MOU is the scope of work. This section of the
5 MOU describes what portions the state plan -- what
6 portions of the state plan the -- I want to call it a
7 public service. That's not right. The participating
8 state agency implementing. So because it may take some
9 time to work through all of the details around this,
10 the participating state agencies may submit preliminary
11 scopes of work with their MOUs and their applications.
12 So this is the point that Joanne was just making. So
13 the point is to clarify and dig deeper about the work
14 to be done if a state is awarded the grant. And there
15 will be up to 90 days for a state to do that.

16 And it looks like I jumped a slide, so
17 forgive me. So I was just going a little bit deeper
18 into the MOUs. But let's go to slide 38, and here's a
19 chart that we've pulled out here, and it's just for you
20 to fill out so that we know which participating state
21 agency, so just list the name for the lead and the lead
22 agency. In the second column we've got the MOU
23 location and the application, so we want to know where
24 do we find it, so indicate the page number. And then
25 in the third column we want to know what funds and

1 programs are administered by the participating state
2 agency.

3 So again, it's just information for us, and I
4 say us. Joan was making the distinction earlier that
5 the reviewers are looking at your -- judging and
6 assessing your application, but as it pertains to this
7 eligibility requirement the Departments of Ed and HHS
8 will be making that determination. So we want to be
9 able to find the information pretty quickly.

10 Okay. So we talked about slide 39 already,
11 about modifying the MOU. So now let's move forward to
12 slide 40. Okay. So now we're coming back to selection
13 Criterion (A)(3). And this last part of the criterion
14 which is sub-criterion (c) asks about stakeholder
15 commitment to the state's plans and goals. So here in
16 part 1 we ask specifically about the support the state
17 has from those organizations that provide assistance to
18 groups of affiliated programs. And these organizations
19 are likely to be critical to the implementation of the
20 state's plan. So demonstrations of their support are
21 called out separately. In part 2 we ask about broader
22 support from all kinds of stakeholders across the
23 state.

24 Okay. Let's talk for a moment about the
25 early learning intermediary organization. So that's

1 pulled here in this purple box. So these are the
2 organizations that represent or have influence or
3 authority over networks of programs. So we've given
4 several examples here in the definition like the Child
5 Care Resource and Referral agency or state affiliates
6 of large scale national support organizations. So
7 you'll need to see the list of all the intermediary
8 organizations in your state and indicate which have
9 provided letters of support. And you can include that
10 in your appendix of your application.

11 Please note that stakeholder and other
12 letters of support sent to ED or HHS separately from
13 the application will not be considered by the
14 reviewers. So all of your materials must arrive
15 together in one package so that it can be considered.

16 Okay. So now let's talk about the evidence.
17 So we've required all of these things, and now we just
18 want to just spend some time talking about how we want
19 you to demonstrate what we've asked of you. So on
20 pages 42 to 43 of the application you'll see the
21 evidence that's requested for this selection criteria.
22 There are two tables that you'll need to fill out in
23 addition to the narrative box. So for the first table,
24 which is (A)(3)-1, it asks you to list all
25 participating state agencies together with their roles

1 and responsibilities. On the second table, which is
2 (A)(3)-2, it asks you to list all of the early learning
3 intermediary organizations in your state and whether
4 each has provided a letter of intent or support. So
5 hopefully that's really clear to you.

6 Okay. So there's one more eligibility
7 requirement that's worth discussing because we received
8 a number of questions about it. So on page 24 of your
9 application you'll see that to be eligible to receive
10 funds under the Race to the Top - Early Learning
11 Challenge competition, the state must have an
12 operational state advisory council on early care and
13 education that meets the requirements that's described
14 in Section 642(b) of the Head Start Act. So this means
15 that the state advisory council must be designated or
16 established by the governor, include the required
17 membership and carry out the required activities that
18 are described in the Head Start Act.

19 Just to be clear, the state does not have to
20 be a current recipient of federal ARRA state advisory
21 council funds to qualify, but it must meet all of the
22 requirements in Section 642(b) of the Head Start Act.

23 We received a few questions about whether
24 those states that do not have federal funds supporting
25 their state early childhood advisory councils are

1 eligible. Again, the answer is yes. So as long as you
2 meet the three requirements which is the governor
3 designation or establishment, the required membership
4 that's spelled out in the Head Start Act as well as the
5 required activities, then you are eligible. You can
6 also find this clarification that I just made in the
7 FAQs on page 4, and its letter or number A-6.

8 The other point that I just want to make here
9 about the eligibility requirement about the state
10 advisory councils is that on page 25 you'll be asked --
11 of your application you'll be asked to check a box to
12 certify if in fact your state has an operational state
13 advisory council, the way that we just defined it here,
14 and that it meets these three requirements. Again, the
15 departments, ED and HHS, not the reviewers, will
16 determine whether or not your state has met this
17 eligibility requirement.

18 So I think that is it. Before I turn over to
19 Beth Caron to start talking about the budget, let me
20 see if there are any questions about the last pieces
21 that I walked through. So there's a question here on
22 this side of the room where I'm pointing.

23 MS. GRACE: Oh, me. Sorry. I thought you
24 were pointing somewhere -- sorry. Cathy Grace,
25 Mississippi.

1 On the phone call it was asked I think at the
2 other Webinar how many letters of support, and someone
3 commented we don't need hundreds, or we don't want it
4 to be overwhelming. So I guess the question is a
5 balance about, you know, we could get hundreds of
6 support letters, but that's not necessarily the intent
7 I don't think. So is there any guidance about
8 approximately how big a case we need to make? If it's
9 in terms of doing it on a table, that would be more
10 efficient, but I guess you need the support.

11 MS. ONUNAKU: So that's a good question, and
12 really it's up to the state's discretion to decide how
13 many, what makes sense. I mean you know what you have
14 in your state, and you know who the supporters are, so
15 the burden will be on you to decide well, how many do
16 we need. So we're -- and again, I know that you're
17 trying to balance out length and, you know, how many
18 pages you're submitting. Including it in the appendix
19 is just fine, so you don't have to worry about, you
20 know, are we including too much. So use your
21 discretion to decide how many is appropriate. And
22 again, it's got to come in together in one package.

23 There's a question here. Yes.

24 MS. BLOUGH: Yes, I'm Joan Blough from
25 Michigan.

1 I do notice that you reference local early
2 learning advisory councils and say if applicable, but
3 there's not a definition, so should I assume that if we
4 have something that we would consider a local early
5 learning advisory council we should just move forward
6 with that and get those letters? Would that be
7 accurate?

8 MS. CARON: And you're talking about the
9 letters of support, not the eligibility requirement of
10 your state advisory council, right?

11 MS. BLOUGH: Right. Yes.

12 MS. CARON: Yes, that's fine.

13 There's a question here in the middle of the
14 room.

15 MS. MILLER: Carol Miller from Minnesota.
16 I'm not sure if this is the correct place to ask this
17 question, but you were talking about the things that
18 can happen in the 90 days after one were to get an
19 award, and one of the things we weren't clear on was in
20 the Federal Register where it asked for various
21 assurances and whether those were to be provided up
22 front or only if we were funded.

23 MS. CARON: There are assurances that are
24 listed in the application that you need to provide with
25 the application. So those come in at the same time as

1 the application.

2 MS. MILLER: Okay.

3 MS. CARON: Does that answer your question or
4 is it --

5 MS. MILLER: Well, the ones that were listed
6 in the Register were things like the civil rights laws
7 that prohibit discrimination in programs, blah, blah,
8 blah --

9 MS. CARON: They're -- just -- when you're
10 reading it be careful. Just check what you're reading
11 because there are program requirements, and program
12 requirements are things that you comply with after
13 you've been awarded. There are assurances that are
14 actually things that you need to have, like you have to
15 have the Attorney General sign. So the things that are
16 assurances it's pretty -- it should be pretty
17 straightforward, but if it's not we'll go back and
18 revisit it. So everything other than the program
19 requirements are things you need up front. The program
20 requirements are after you receive a grant, things that
21 you need to continue. We'll talk about those again
22 later on.

23 MS. MILLER: Thank you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I just add one
25 thing to that? So in the application itself, the

1 assurances that you need to sign, we've taken care of
2 it all. So the language is in there. You can just
3 read the language and put your signature there, and it
4 matches what's in the Federal Register, so that's pre-
5 done for you in the application.

6 MS. ONUNAKU: Any other questions?

7 Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have a couple
9 from --

10 MS. ONUNAKU: Oh, please.

11 MS. CARON: Yeah. One of the questions we
12 got from John in Washington was what is the difference
13 between a letter of support and a letter of intent?
14 And I -- that's -- those are just put in there as two
15 separate ideas so you can capture whether you really
16 want to describe what they're doing and the intent that
17 they have to do something to help the plan along like
18 what an intermediary organization might do to help the
19 plan. That might be more of a letter of intent.
20 Someone else might just write a letter that says we
21 support what the program says. So we put that in there
22 just to show you that you can decide for yourself and
23 describe what you want your supporters to be sort of
24 signing on to, and so that's up to you how you decide
25 that and how you use that.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry. And so we've
2 had a couple of questions from the regional offices,
3 folks sitting in the regional offices, about program
4 standards and what exactly that means. And I just want
5 to let those folks know that we're going to hold on
6 those questions until later because we're going to talk
7 a whole lot about kind of the expectations there. So
8 hang on to those questions. We are going to get those.

9 We've also had a couple questions about
10 evaluation requirements, and so also hold on to those.
11 We're getting to those both in the TQRIS section and in
12 program requirements.

13 MS. CARON: Questions in the back?

14 MS. GROVE-DeJARNETT: Hi. Gretchen Grove-
15 DeJarnett, West Virginia.

16 Our governor designated the early childhood
17 advisory council as the lead agency for the Race to the
18 Top. Our state is a little different in that we have a
19 Department of Education and the Arts which is separate
20 from the Department of Education. The Department of
21 Education and the Arts is not listed as a required
22 agency in the Race to the Top, but they serve as the
23 fiscal agent for the early childhood advisory council.
24 Can they serve as the fiscal agent for this grant as
25 well since --

1 MS. ONUNAKU: That's a good question.

2 Joanne?

3 MS. CARON: So you're saying that they would
4 be the lead agency is what you're saying?

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Here you go.

6 MS. CARON: So --

7 MS. GROVE-DeJARNETT: The council is the lead
8 agency I guess for governance purposes of the grant,
9 and everything for the grant will flow through the
10 ECAC. But they have a fiscal agent of their own which
11 is the Department of Education and the Arts.

12 MS. CARON: So it's like they're housed
13 there?

14 MS. GROVE-DeJARNETT: Yes, they are housed in
15 the --

16 MS. CARON: I think that would be fine.

17 MS. GROVE-DeJARNETT: Okay. Thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- do they have to
19 sign -- is the Department of Education and Arts a
20 participating agency and do they have an MOU?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. The MOU should
22 reflect that fact and there should be --

23 MS. CARON: And they -- right. They would
24 have an MOU; they would sign an MOU; and they would
25 also have an MOU with the other agencies that were

1 involved.

2 MS. ONUNAKU: Okay. We're good. Okay.

3 Beth?

4 MS. CARON: Okay. All right. We're going to
5 give you a couple more questions that we got from the
6 regions. Let me see. I haven't read this one yet so
7 "Must the state advisory council" -- this is from
8 California. "Must the state advisory council be
9 operational at the time of submission?" And I think
10 they're asking --

11 MS. ONUNAKU: Yes.

12 MS. CARON: -- what, to define operational?

13 MS. ONUNAKU: Operational --

14 MS. CARON: And operational means it is
15 operating.

16 (Laughter)

17 MS. CARON: Not to be too federal. So yes,
18 you must have an operating state advisory council that
19 meets those requirements. Again it doesn't have to
20 receive funding under the Head Start Act, the ARRA
21 funds.

22 MS. ONUNAKU: Yeah. I mean it might seem a
23 little humorous, but I think it's just worth repeating
24 that it's got to meet those required activities, the
25 membership requirement, and it's got to be designated

1 by the governor.

2 MS. CARON: All right. And we also have --
3 hold one second.

4 MS. ONUNAKU: Is it one more question under
5 here or --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: These are not related
7 to the --

8 MS. ONUNAKU: Okay. So we should switch.

9 MS. CARON: It just made more sense for me to
10 talk from this mic than -- I brought my water because I
11 think I might be here for a while because we're talking
12 about budget next so -- but there's a couple of
13 questions that came from the regions, and again we've
14 got a couple of questions about the budget sections, so
15 I'll be getting to those right now. So hold on,
16 regions.

17 We also got a question that came in earlier
18 from Christie in South Carolina and this is about --
19 she asks whether the number of children that we're --
20 that you're reporting in the states, whether those
21 numbers are cumulative or whether it's point in time.
22 And I think she was specifically speaking to Table
23 (A)(1)-5, and that will depend on the data that you're
24 providing and the data that you have in your state.
25 [Note: Clarified on pp 81-82 that this is point in time

1 data]. So what we ask is that you indicate the source.
2 There's a place in the table in most places where you
3 can say what the source is. So just -- again, just
4 describe that. Use footnotes if you need to use
5 footnotes. If you want to describe it further, go
6 ahead in your narrative; tie it back; explain it. So
7 this is really, you know, we know that you're all doing
8 things differently, and that's why we are trying to be
9 as flexible as we can on that. So just use what you
10 need to use.

11 And let me see if I had a couple others from
12 the -- let's see. Oh, one of these is about the
13 budget, so I'll go ahead and give it to you right now.
14 It's from --

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we just go back to
16 that (A)(1)-5 question?

17 MS. CARON: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because it is
19 specifically point in time. It is not cumulative on
20 (A)(1)-5 because it specifically says like the annual
21 census count, for example, the enrollment on
22 October 1 --

23 MS. CARON: Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- or whatever. So
25 each of them has a specific way that you are supposed

1 to get that snapshot moment in time.

2 MS. CARON: Right, right. My apologies. So
3 that one really was -- I was confusing two different
4 things there and reading my note cards incorrectly.

5 The idea is that you'll have different ways
6 in which you collect that point in time data in your
7 state, so it might be a December 1 count. It might be
8 some other, you know, time that you do it. But
9 whatever your one point count is, that's what we want
10 you to describe. So you'll give your source. You'll
11 explain that. You'll tell us where you got it and how
12 you got it. So hopefully that didn't mess you guys up
13 completely.

14 Okay. We got another one that's about the
15 budget, so we'll talk about that one first because I
16 know it's going to come up for the rest of you. And
17 this one is "will the grants be awarded on an all or
18 nothing basis?" I'm not exactly sure -- this is from I
19 want to say Arnie or Amy in Maine. So clarify if I
20 don't answer your question exactly. I'm not sure what
21 the all or nothing refers to. So that we need to get
22 your clarification on.

23 And the other one is "is the amount that is
24 requested the amount that you'll be getting, or will
25 that be reduced?" The idea is that we've put in the

1 budget caps. We'll talk about the budget caps, and
2 we'll talk about that in a moment. All of your funds
3 have to be allowable. We'll do budget negotiations.
4 We'll review these budgets before we allot any money,
5 so they have to be reasonable. So we don't anticipate
6 reducing anyone's budgets. That's not what we're going
7 to try to do, but we are going to look through to make
8 sure that all of your costs are appropriate and
9 allowable costs. So hopefully that answers that.

10 But Amy, give us another email if that didn't
11 clarify your question.

12 And there's also an FAQ on that on page 8.
13 It's C-2, how will the grant sizes be determined?

14 So do we have another -- okay.

15 All right. Then let's move into the budget
16 section. Does everyone want to stretch because this is
17 like a fun one, so I will point out that we do have a
18 budget section in the FAQ document as well, Section G,
19 so we have a whole section devoted to -- just to
20 budget.

21 So let me find my clicker here. And
22 basically this is the budget overview so we're going
23 to, we're going to talk about the whole aspect of the
24 budget, and the first part that I just mentioned is
25 about the budget caps. In the application on page 75

1 you saw that there's a chart that says these are the
2 amounts that you can submit your request for, up to
3 those amounts, and those are caps. If you put in a
4 request over those caps we will not consider that
5 application for funding. So those caps are caps. So
6 keep that in mind as you're planning.

7 And we got a question on the webinar about
8 whether this is -- the caps are the entire amount for
9 the four years or whether that's an annual amount and
10 we wish we could say -- give you a different answer,
11 but this is for the entire four-year period of your
12 grant. You decide whether you need to distribute that
13 evenly across the four years, whether you need
14 additional startup costs at the beginning, so your
15 costs may be greater in one area at the beginning, or
16 you may have, you know, personnel and fringe benefit
17 increases over the four years. It does not need to be
18 evenly distributed across the four years.

19 Okay. On slide 45, this is about -- we're
20 going to start talking about the criteria. This is
21 (A)(4) and (A)(4) has three sections to it, so there
22 are three parts to this criterion. And the first
23 section -- the first part (a) is about the existing
24 funds that you're going to be leveraging in your state.
25 The second part will be budgeting for the activities in

1 your plan, and the third part is demonstrating
2 sustainability. So we'll talk about each of them in
3 detail, and then we'll come back and we'll talk about
4 the evidence for each of them as well.

5 So sub-criterion (a) is about using the
6 existing funds that will further your plans, the
7 activities within your plan, and the objective here is
8 to really align and coordinate the resources across all
9 of the agencies and programs and all of the work that's
10 being done in your state. And again, think about the
11 larger context that this is really trying to pull
12 together a system of early learning and development in
13 your state. So the idea being to provide more access
14 to more children who are high need with high-quality
15 early learning and development options.

16 So we'll go over each of the sections
17 separately, and this is (b). So sub-criterion (b) is
18 where you'll talk about the funds that you're
19 allocating and how you're going to use those to support
20 the activities in your plan. So what we're looking
21 for, what the application calls for and what the
22 reviewers are going to be looking at here is whether
23 the activities you've aligned or outlined are tied to
24 the budget that you're requesting, and is it adequate,
25 is it reasonable, and is it necessary to achieve the

1 outcomes that you're trying to achieve. So this is
2 really where you paint the picture; you tie together
3 your funds with your activities. Make it clear to the
4 viewers this is what we want to do, this is why we're
5 doing it, and this is how we're going to pay for it.
6 So that's what you want to be doing in this section.

7 So the budget tables require you to include
8 details about all of the money that you're going to be
9 allocating to your participating state agencies and how
10 their work as participating state agencies ties into
11 the larger state plan. And you want all of that to add
12 up to something that you know is going to have
13 outcomes -- good outcomes for kids and families.

14 So subcriterion (c) is how you'll demonstrate
15 after the end of the grant period how you're planning
16 to sustain the activities that you've put so much
17 energy and effort into so far. We -- there are no
18 budget forms that are associated with this section
19 because this is really what you're going to talk about
20 in your narrative. If you feel like a budget table
21 helps for this, then by all means add it, but this is
22 where you'll talk about the sustainability of your plan
23 in your narrative description section.

24 Okay. On slide 48 we're going to start
25 talking about the evidence sections, and the evidence

1 for section (a) is a completed table that lists all of
2 the existing funds by source. So you're going to list
3 each source that you have funds for and the funds that
4 you're going to be using that you're going to be
5 allocating or reallocating for the purposes of this
6 plan. So in other words, what activities are you
7 already engaged in that are being funded by somewhere?
8 Now you're going to be using existing funds to help
9 support new activities that you're proposing in this
10 plan. So that's what this table is looking for, and
11 here's where you'll outline those sources of
12 information.

13 You can again modify this table. You can add
14 additional rows obviously, but you could add additional
15 information, use footnotes where you need to. This is
16 one that you'd obviously want to expand we hope.

17 So on the next slide we're going to go over
18 the evidence for (A)(4)(b).

19 We have a question first. I'm sorry.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question on
21 (A)(4)(a). So if this grant starts January 1, 2012,
22 which is in the middle of a lot of states' fiscal year,
23 so should we do like six months of fiscal 2012 and six
24 months of 2016 on the table?

25 MS. CARON: The way that that -- the idea is

1 for the four years of your grant so you would decide
2 what -- I mean you would have to use your judgment for
3 what you have easy access to in terms of data. But we
4 want something laid out for all four years of your
5 grant. So if your grant starts January 1 to the
6 middle, then you'd probably have to do --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Extra columns.

8 MS. CARON: Extra columns if that's the
9 easiest way to do it. Yeah, I would, I would think
10 that -- but that probably has to be --

11 MS. WEISS: I actually think this
12 particular -- the budget tables we want calendar year
13 tables -- [Note: this was clarified on p.91 to explain
14 that Table (A)(4)-1 can be completed by state fiscal
15 year rather than calendar year].

16 MS. CARON: Calendar year.

17 MS. WEISS: -- so that the reviewers and
18 everybody can look at it if you can do it. That will
19 make everything apples to apples across all of the
20 applicants.

21 MS. CARON: There's a lot of groaning.

22 MS. WEISS: Huge groan duly noted. We can
23 take that up during our break and see if there's --

24 MS. CARON: Groan noted. Yeah. We'll talk
25 about that over lunch and see if we can't think of a

1 better -- yeah. The idea is that people are going to
2 be looking -- the reviewers are going to be looking at
3 these plans on a yearly basis. Here are the activities
4 you're undertaking in year one and the activities
5 you're undertaking in year two and the costs associated
6 with them. So that's the general idea. Where that is
7 going to be a disconnect will make it harder for them
8 to really judge. So that's -- but we'll talk about
9 that.

10 Did we have another question? Yes.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You talked about for
12 new activities, but for instance, if we're expanding a
13 current activity to take it to scale with help from the
14 grant, would we have our current funding for that
15 activity in this section?

16 MS. CARON: Again, that would be -- it would
17 be up to you and what you're describing. So what
18 you're saying is under your plan you're going to do
19 some expansion, that you might not be thinking of it as
20 a new activity, but it is something you're undertaking
21 as part of this grant, you may be using that same
22 funding, and you want to now pull that into this grant.
23 That's what -- that's exactly what we're sort of
24 looking --

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So if I put in my

1 current funding that I'm using, and then in my other
2 section I'm saying what part of the grant funds I'm
3 using to expand that current spending --

4 MS. CARON: This is -- you're talking about
5 the table where we add sources from other --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right, right. I'm
7 talking about the one we're -- what is it (A)(4)-1, the
8 source of the funds from existing --

9 MS. CARON: From existing --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- federal, state,
11 private local funds to achieve the outcomes.

12 MS. CARON: So this is money outside of the
13 grant funds. This is other sources that you're
14 using --

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. Outside. But
16 it can be something we're currently spending on that.
17 Doesn't have to be a change.

18 MS. CARON: What you're currently spending
19 and then talk about how what you're doing is going to
20 be different. So it won't be helpful to reviewers to
21 just get a list of all the things you're currently
22 doing and the money you're currently spending.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Only if it fits
24 in the plan.

25 MS. CARON: Right, right. It's how you're

1 now taking existing funds and taking it to the next
2 level and doing something different with it that aligns
3 with the plan. Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

5 MS. WEISS: Beth, I'm sorry. I do -- this
6 table -- I was thinking it was the budget tables that
7 were showing. This table is fine to leave fiscal year.

8 MS. CARON: Okay.

9 MS. WEISS: State fiscal year. Just clarify
10 for us what that is.

11 MS. CARON: Okay.

12 MS. WEISS: But this one is fine to leave
13 state fiscal year.

14 MS. CARON: Right. So for all of you who are
15 in the regions and didn't catch this, we're on Table
16 (A)(4)-1. This is where you're talking about existing
17 resources, so that can be fiscal state year. Just tell
18 us what your year is, too, because it's different from,
19 you know, state to state. So where it is, just let us
20 know what it looks like. [Note: this section corrects
21 the statements on page 88 of this transcript].

22 Do we have a question in the middle? I think
23 we have a question formulating in the middle but while
24 it's -- while we -- are you ready? No? Okay.

25 While questions are formulating then we'll go

1 to the next slide. Okay. All right. So this --

2 Oh, here is our question. It's formulated.

3 I knew if I gave it a minute it would percolate up.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So just a question

5 about the fiscal year. So it would -- so since

6 January 1, 2012 is in the middle of fiscal year 2011,

7 so really sort of the first column would be the last

8 six months of fiscal year 2011?

9 MS. CARON: That's what --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And then the very last

11 column would be the first six months of fiscal year

12 2015, right?

13 MS. CARON: I guess that's the way they'd

14 have to do it. Yeah, yeah. I guess -- I'm trying to

15 think of another way, and I can't think of one, so

16 yeah. I mean add another column if you need another

17 column. If you want to go on with, you know, yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And then related to

19 that, is the money is to -- when we get the money is it

20 to be spent -- does the Tydings Amendment apply? Like

21 can you have an extra 12 months or is it like --

22 MS. CARON: There is the possibility of a no-

23 cost extension if you haven't used your funds and your

24 activities are not finished that we could extend

25 beyond. It's a limited no-cost extension, so that

1 you'd need to get approval from the departments and
2 explain what and why, but it is not automatic.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But it's not --

4 MS. CARON: It's not automatic by any means,
5 and it is also time limited because there is a period
6 of -- because these are forward-funded grants there's
7 only a five-year window at which funds can be spent
8 before they have to revert to treasury. So don't think
9 about like stringing it out for six or seven years.
10 That won't work so -- and this is for a four-year plan.

11 MS.PETERNITH: And Tydings doesn't
12 specifically apply to discretionary grants so -- but
13 you'll have the four-year budget period plus the fifth
14 year that Beth mentioned.

15 MS. CARON: Is that clear?

16 Okay. So let's dig into the parts of the
17 budget. So on slide 50 we have an outline for you here
18 of the parts of the budget. So basically what we're
19 asking you to do is provide your budget information to
20 us in three different views. It's the same numbers
21 that you'll be presenting, but you're going to do it
22 across three different views, and we'll tell you why
23 that's important. The views are -- you're going to be
24 providing information by budget category, and these are
25 the things you're all probably used to seeing. It's

1 personnel, travel, etc., etc., etc. So the budget
2 categories.

3 You'll also be providing tables and
4 information on the budgets by participating state
5 agencies, so this is where reviewers can see this
6 agency has this amount of funds to do these activities.
7 It ties to their MOU. And again, that's outlined by
8 each participating state agency that has fiscal or
9 financial responsibilities under your plan.

10 And then the third way is by project. So
11 you're going to outline by project how you're going to
12 show the funds that you're going to use for the
13 activities that you want to further your plan. And I'm
14 going to jump -- I had this on the next slide, but I'm
15 going to jump to what is a project. So just to give
16 you a sense, there will be -- the project is the group
17 of activities around which you're going to try to sort
18 of move the needle in your state and make a difference.
19 So when you think about your project's activities it
20 may be that one project is -- aligns perfectly with one
21 of the criterion. So you might have a project that's
22 just about, you know, I'm trying to think of a good --
23 I had an example in my notes here, about (C)(1) which
24 is about early learning and development standards. So
25 you may have one project that's very neatly around

1 early learning development standards. And you may have
2 multiple participating state agencies who are involved
3 in that. So that's one project. You'd have that
4 budget line in different participating agencies as
5 well.

6 Or you may have a couple of criterion that
7 come together. So you might have two criterion around
8 TQRIS that you want to bundle together into a project.
9 So you might have a project that aligns with like
10 (B)(1) and (B)(2). That's up to you to decide. You
11 figure out the best way to do it. Again, you're
12 painting a picture. You make it clear enough for the
13 reviewers. You describe how you want this whole thing
14 to look. And the idea is to make sure that the budget
15 that you have aligns to the plans that you've outlined
16 and that it's clear enough for reviewers to be able to
17 judge is it accurate, is it enough, is it sufficient,
18 and is it the right amount of funding for the right,
19 you know, so that's the idea behind the different views
20 that we're looking for.

21 So you also -- in addition to your tables
22 you're going to have narratives where you're going to
23 describe, and a table alone can't tell the whole story,
24 so the narrative is where you're going to describe what
25 you want the reviewers to see. Make it clear to the

1 reviewers how your budget connects with your projects.
2 It sounds obvious but it's an important point.

3 In each of the participating state agency
4 budgets that you'll be doing, that's where you'll be
5 writing a narrative that describes what the
6 participating agency has responsibility for, how
7 they're going to be overseeing this, how they're going
8 to be managing these funds and what exactly their
9 activities are going to be.

10 You'll also be -- just to note that the
11 participating state agency budgets that you'll provide
12 a detailed explanation of how the funds will be used in
13 each of the budget categories so that again you're
14 coming back to budget categories. I'll show you
15 exactly what I mean when we give a couple examples.

16 Okay. I made a little extra note here. The
17 idea is to complete the budgets first for each
18 participating state agency, and I'll explain why that's
19 important, because we've given you some tools that we
20 think will be helpful in making this task a little bit
21 easier. If you start with the participating state
22 agency budgets, we'll show you in the Excel form that
23 we've done how that can roll up for you. So if you
24 start with what amount of funds each participating
25 state agency is going to get, then you'll be able to

1 roll that up into the different summary tables that you
2 need to report to us in the application.

3 Okay. So on the next slide, this is the
4 example of the first one which is a participating state
5 agency budget table. This is Table (A)(2) -- I mean,
6 sorry, II-1, and you're going to complete one of these
7 tables for every participating state agency that has
8 some fiscal responsibility. And again, you'll see this
9 is by budget category, so each participating state
10 agency table is done by budget category and one of
11 these for each participating state agency that's in
12 your plan.

13 You'll notice that in the lines here you'll
14 see that there are budget uses, personnel, fringe
15 benefits, equipment sales, etc., contracting. I want
16 to draw your attention to a couple of them. You can
17 also budget for indirect costs. You should have an
18 agreed-upon indirect cost agreement, and there's a form
19 in the application that has you fill out what your
20 current indirect cost agreement amount is and who the
21 agency is that you have that agreement with. So you
22 can put in for indirect costs as well.

23 You also have a line in here which is line
24 11, which is for funding to the locals, to intermediary
25 organizations, and this is where we've already gotten a

1 couple of questions, and we think this is an important
2 one to spend a moment on. You -- sub-granting is not
3 allowable under this competition. It's not written
4 into the legislation, so we just don't have any
5 flexibility on that. However, you can get money down
6 to the locals, to intermediary organizations, to local
7 programs, to whoever you need to get it down to get
8 your work done through contracts, through whatever sub-
9 awarding is allowable under your state's procurement
10 laws. So you have -- you can do it through an MOU if
11 it's within the same agency, so you have options for
12 how to get it down, but you cannot sub-grant in the
13 traditional sense so --

14 Can we get a microphone just so we can get
15 this on transcription? Because I'm sure this is one
16 that's going to --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When you say sub-grant
18 you mean specifically on this application you don't
19 want us to give -- to be naming someone other than your
20 state agency. But once we have the money as a state
21 agency we could grant it out, or we can't grant it out?

22 MS. CARON: You cannot do -- you are not
23 allowed to make sub-grants to other entities, so you
24 cannot make a grant to another local. You can use
25 other vehicles. You can use contracting --

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What other vehicle?

2 MS. CARON: -- you can use contracting, you
3 can use MOUs, you can use whatever your state will
4 allow outside of grants.

5 Yeah. I know. It's an unusual -- but it's
6 the way it's written in the legislation so yeah.

7 Is that clear to folks or --

8 Okay. All right. We'll let you all absorb
9 that a minute because we know that's different than
10 what has historically been the case in the past.

11 So whatever your interagency agreements are,
12 contracts, whatever your allowable -- but keep in mind
13 your own procurement laws.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's a question.
15 Could you wait for the mic --

16 MS. CARON: Can we define grant? Okay. The
17 question is can we define grant versus contract. I
18 wish I could define that. And as long as I've been
19 working here I don't -- I mean is there an easy way for
20 us to explain what is the difference between a grant
21 and a contract? Like how do we define a grant versus a
22 contract? I mean --

23 Yeah, I think -- again, I think it's state --
24 whatever your state law says. Your state procurement
25 laws would say this is what constitutes a grant, and

1 this is what constitutes a contract. I know at the
2 federal level we have very particular rules around what
3 a contract can look like, what it can do, what it can't
4 do versus a grant and how that can work so --

5 MS. HESS: Well, and it's our understanding,
6 and again I'm not an expert on your different state
7 laws, but we know that some states have a lot of
8 flexibility with the kinds of agreements they can make
9 with their other agencies in their state. So that will
10 really be dependent on your state laws. So --

11 MS. CARON: Oh, yeah, they -- see --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

13 MS. CARON: Yeah.

14 MS. WEISS: So one thing that we did discover
15 as we were researching this is that the people in your
16 states who are administering the IDEA funds --

17 MS. CARON: The Part C funds, yeah.

18 MS. WEISS: Part C, do get the money down to
19 locals through some kind of sub-award process that is
20 okay under most state procurement laws. So you might
21 start by talking to them about how to do this in a
22 world where grants aren't allowed but other kinds of
23 things under your state procurement laws like sub-
24 awards are. So that's what we -- we started with our
25 IDEA Part C folks, and we recommend you guys do the

1 same.

2 MS. CARON: Yes. Question here.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you already have a
4 grant with an entity can you increase the amount of the
5 grant?

6 MS. CARON: I don't believe so. I think that
7 would --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As long as it's not a
9 new one? No?

10 MS. CARON: Yeah. I think that would
11 constitute sub-granting [and would be unallowable].

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

13 MS. CARON: In the back?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can some type of sub-
15 award process still be competitive or does it need to
16 be --

17 MS. CARON: Yes, absolutely. Yeah, yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

19 MS. CARON: And again, that's however you'll
20 do it in your state. It doesn't have to be -- yeah,
21 absolutely it can be a competitive process. Yeah

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

23 MS. CARON: Right. It just can't be a grant
24 under your state laws for granting.

25 MS. RUDISILL: You know, Beth, I would just

1 add on the HHS side, at least since in CCDF, we know
2 you make grants under that, and as Beth mentioned there
3 was a legal reason we couldn't have sub-granting here.
4 But there are also many other ways that folks push
5 money down to the local and program level using CCDF.
6 So in addition to IDEA, you might want to, you know,
7 might want to think through the most innovating
8 practices you have there.

9 MS. CARON: Um-hum. A question in the corner
10 here.

11 MS. GRACE: Yes. Cathy Grace from
12 Mississippi.

13 In terms of clarification one more time here,
14 if your state currently has an award with an entity
15 through a competitive process and what this -- part of
16 what their job would be would be to extend what they're
17 already doing, is that a re-competition, or it can be
18 added on to an existing contract that was awarded
19 through competition because I thought you said a while
20 ago it can be competitive, but that didn't say to me
21 that it had to be competitive.

22 MS. CARON: I think what you -- you need to
23 talk to your state procurement folks and your budget
24 folks and say what are we allowed to do here and
25 they'll -- they should be able to tell you that

1 because, you know, it's not about whether you can just
2 add on here or add on there. You really have to
3 understand from them whether this violates the state
4 laws about sub-granting, and it only applies to sub-
5 granting. In terms of the competitive preference on
6 how you move money down, as long as you're not sub-
7 granting that's how it's allowable in your state. So
8 you'd have to talk to specifically state by state.

9 MS. GRACE: So this prohibits sub-granting?

10 MS. CARON: Correct.

11 MS. GRACE: But it does not prohibit a
12 contract?

13 MS. CARON: No, absolutely not. Contracts,
14 interagency agreements, MOUs, those are all ways that
15 you can be using the money and get it down to locals.
16 This is a particular, you know, a very particular,
17 specific to this program problem or issue that you
18 cannot sub-grant. There's just not authority in the
19 legislation to allow for sub-granting. So it's quite
20 specific so yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just referring to
22 G-1 --

23 MS. CARON: Yeah. We have a, we have a more
24 specific FAQ in G-1 in the FAQ budget section. The
25 first one is about sub-granting because we knew this

1 was going to be an issue, so refer to that one for
2 more.

3 Okay. Let's move back to our budget tables,
4 and in addition to getting the money down to locals and
5 indirect costs, you'd also have -- so your other funds
6 that are not going to any of those locals in the way
7 that we just described, you'd put your contracts in
8 budget line 6. So there's going to be -- there may be
9 contracts in both places. If you're contracting to
10 locals for part of the program and to local
11 intermediary organizations, that's going to happen on
12 line 11. And if your -- the rest of your contracts are
13 basically going to be on line 6. And again, you're
14 going to do a budget narrative where you're going to
15 describe all this, so it's going to be clear.

16 The reviewers will see these tables. They
17 will read your narrative. They will understand what
18 you're trying to say. So use your narrative and use
19 your overall budget narrative as well to explain how
20 this all ties together.

21 And then the funds that we talked about that
22 you'll be repurposing or reallocating from other
23 sources, there's a line specific to that which is
24 line 14 in your budget table, and you'll be putting
25 that amount down there as well. And again, this is by

1 participating state agency, so you'll just be including
2 that information as well.

3 So there's a lot in these tables, and you'll
4 be providing a lot of data and a lot of information.
5 But what we did is we built Excel -- an Excel workbook
6 which has worksheets for each of the things that you'll
7 be reporting on, and I just want to talk to you for a
8 minute about how that will work. So you'll get your
9 total amount there.

10 You'll have -- you'll notice that there's a
11 total grant amount funds. That's line 13. That's
12 going to be the total amount that you're getting from
13 the grant, and then below that is going to be your
14 other additional funds to give you a grand total. So I
15 just want you to -- point that out to you.

16 Okay. So this --

17 DR. JONES: So Beth?

18 MS. CARON: Yes.

19 DR. JONES: Before we move on, there's a
20 question --

21 MS. CARON: Question from the region?

22 DR. JONES: -- on Head Start budget?

23 MS. SANCHEZ FUENTES: Hi everybody. So the
24 question is -- oh, sorry. Yvette Sanchez -- Joan just
25 reminded me to say my name. Hi. I am Yvette Sanchez

1 Fuentes. I'm the director for the Office of Head
2 Start. And let me just say this is a really exciting
3 day.

4 So the question is -- it's a budget
5 question -- how are states supposed to address the use
6 of Head Start funds for the purpose of this grant?
7 When the funds go from feds to local grantees, are Head
8 Start T&TA [Training and Technical Assistance] funds
9 supposed to be included as a source of funds to support
10 this effort, or are they off limits?

11 So two things that I would suggest here is
12 that I would encourage states to talk to their local
13 T&TA state Head Start providers. Most of you probably
14 know who those folks are, and if you don't, we are
15 absolutely happy to give you that information
16 specifically because you as a state should know what
17 type of services those T&TA providers are providing to
18 Head Start programs and also to keep in mind that
19 sometimes other early childhood partners are also
20 invited to trainings that the state Head Start T&TA
21 system may have.

22 And the last piece I just want to remind
23 folks about is that the Office of Head Start issued a
24 program instruction to all of our Head Start programs
25 with regards to their participation in Race to the Top

1 applications. You can find that if you visit the
2 ECLKC. But just very briefly it states that we are
3 encouraging programs to participate to the fullest
4 extent possible as long as it doesn't create a conflict
5 between Head Start law and regulations.

6 MS. CARON: Okay. All right. Let's move to
7 slide 52 now. And this slide is about the
8 participating state agencies and what you need to
9 report for each participating state agency with regard
10 to the projects that they will be overseeing,
11 responsible for, working on. And they're -- each of
12 those participating state agencies is expected to look
13 across its total budget for how it's going to be
14 delineating the money for projects. So we want you to
15 keep in mind that the participating state agencies need
16 to keep records of how they're budgeting and how their
17 funds are allocated across the projects during the
18 grant period. So they need to be thinking about that
19 ahead of time, how that will be spent. Even though
20 they don't necessarily have to report all of that
21 detail up in one of these tables, that will still be
22 something that they need to have in their audit file I
23 guess.

24 So here you'll basically just for each of the
25 grant years, and this is year one through four of the

1 grant, so starting January 1 to December 30th of each
2 year. And then you'll list each of the projects, and
3 that's the total amount. So you're not breaking this
4 down by project here. You're just delivering the total
5 amount per project.

6 Okay. And now I made a reference to the
7 budget spreadsheet, so I want to spend a little bit of
8 time going into that in a little more detail. As I
9 mentioned, we built Excel -- an Excel workbook that has
10 tabs for each of the tables that you will be reporting
11 and putting in your application. And those tabs
12 automatically roll up, so that's why we suggest you
13 start with the participating state agency as your
14 beginning point of figuring this out rather than
15 starting at the first tab and moving down. Start with
16 the participating state agency's tab. So this amount
17 of money is going to this participating agency to do
18 this amount -- this kind of work. This amount is going
19 to that state agency for that work. And as you fill
20 out each of those tables, then we have formulas that
21 are built into the Excel spreadsheets that will roll up
22 into the summary tables that you'll basically just have
23 to cut and paste and put into the document.

24 So I'll give you a little more detail about
25 that in a minute, but I just want to tell you why we

1 did that. One is that we have -- we know that it's a
2 complicated thing that we're asking of you, and this is
3 very hard across different agencies and across
4 different projects and all, so we tried to figure out a
5 way to make it a little bit simpler. But also we have
6 very limited time between the end of the competition
7 and when the funds need to be out on December 31st.
8 And we have to go back and forth in the budget
9 negotiations with every winner to say are all of your
10 funds allowable; are they appropriate; are they
11 reasonable, you know, for the purposes of our EDGAR
12 regulations. So you -- there are certain things you
13 cannot use funds for, and those are clearly outlined in
14 our EDGAR regulations.

15 So in order to do that, get that budget
16 negotiation through, we need to make sure that the
17 numbers are accurate. In past competitions we've used
18 Word documents, and people have typed in all the cells
19 and then typed in and there's no adding-up function
20 that guarantees you get the numbers right. If --
21 wherever they don't match we have to come back and talk
22 to you and have a conversation, and there can be a lot
23 of back and forth. So we tried to alleviate that
24 problem. And because you're providing summary tables,
25 this way you can cut and paste the summary table right

1 out of Excel and just drop it right into the Word
2 version, whatever, you know, your application looks
3 like, wherever it needs to go.

4 So that is on our website. You can see it,
5 look at it today. You can download it. You can do
6 whatever you need to do. It is set up right now to
7 have 15 participating state agencies and 10 projects.
8 Or is it the other way around? No, it's 10
9 participating state agencies and 15 projects. We don't
10 expect that you're going to have that many, but that
11 was the best way to set it up so we could have formulas
12 and have it all roll up. If we had it five and you
13 ended up with a sixth, then it wouldn't work for you.
14 So we wanted to make it be overambitious so that you
15 have as much room as you need to. Just use as many
16 tabs as you need and ignore the rest.

17 So what you'll be doing, there are very
18 explicit, step-by-step instructions in the workbook
19 itself. The first tab of the workbook says
20 "instructions" and it actually goes through now step 1,
21 do this, now step 2, do that. So we're hoping that
22 will be clear enough and easy enough to follow. The
23 idea is as you fill in your participating state agency
24 tables, then it will roll up to a summary table and
25 roll up to another summary table and roll up to a grand

1 summary table, and then you'll literally just cut and
2 paste those cells from those summary tables, and you'll
3 put those into the document.

4 I want to just give you a bit more
5 information about how we'll be using this. So this is
6 for you guys to make it easier for you. It's also
7 easier for us when we're looking at your budgets to be
8 able to see all of the information when we're doing
9 that negotiation and know that the numbers are right.
10 The reviewers will not be reviewing the Excel
11 workbooks, but we are asking you to submit those on the
12 CD/DVD that you submit to us. We'll talk more about
13 submission at the end of the day, and I'll give you
14 more information on that. But we're asking you to put
15 the workbook on the CD as well so that we have that at
16 our disposal for the negotiations that we do. We won't
17 ask reviewers to look through that. They won't see
18 those, but they will see all of the tables that you put
19 into the application. So make sure you've gone through
20 and put in all the required ones. You know, just check
21 carefully that you haven't missed one. So that's how
22 we plan to use the workbooks and why we put them out
23 there for you but that's also not, you know, that's not
24 how -- not what reviewers will be looking at.

25 Okay. So do I have questions on the workbook

1 or what we've gotten so far before we move into the --
2 there are program requirements also that are associated
3 with the budget.

4 Yes, so we have a question in the back?

5 MS. BUTLER: Sorry to ask so many questions.

6 MS. CARON: Oh, no. That's why you guys are
7 here.

8 MS. BUTLER: Mine is about the budget and the
9 way we choose to set it up as a state. Is there any
10 prohibition against using say the first six months of
11 the grant as a planning term as opposed to an
12 implementation term?

13 MS. CARON: We have not outlined any ways in
14 which you need to think about this. And again, it's
15 what the reviewers are going to look at, and they're
16 going to say does this make sense? Is this a feasible
17 way to do this? Is this appropriate? And so really
18 we're not putting any restrictions on the way that you
19 decide to describe it. Just know that the reviewers
20 are going to be looking at it and deciding for
21 themselves, based on their own judgment, whether they
22 think that's a reasonable approach so --

23 MS. BUTLER: Thank you.

24 MS. CARON: I expected to have a ton more
25 like nitty-gritty budget questions that I wasn't

1 prepared for.

2 Oh, we got one from there and we have one
3 up -- we need a microphone up in the front.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So here's one from the
5 regions, back to the sub-granting issue. Can funds be
6 disbursed to local entities providing Part C services
7 if the process is noncompetitive?

8 So -- and I think --

9 MS. CARON: If the process is noncompetitive?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. So I think this
11 is just -- it sounds like a little bit -- it's broader
12 than that. So just to clarify, under this grant you
13 cannot sub-grant to any local entity, and again,
14 looking at the other mechanisms that you can use to get
15 the money to the local entities other than sub-
16 granting. So I think -- hopefully that clarifies it a
17 little bit. And again, for those of the region, I
18 think it was Linda in Tennessee who asked this
19 question, take a look at that specific FAQ, and it was
20 G-1.

21 MS. CARON: G-1. But I think it sounds like
22 it also goes beyond -- it's the competitive nature --

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

24 MS. CARON: -- rather than whether they
25 can -- you just send money down to -- and we haven't

1 said how that has to happen, and that will depend on
2 your state laws, of course. So if your state law
3 allows you to through some mechanism, an MOU, get money
4 down, that's on a noncompetitive basis, I mean that's
5 for your financial offices to decide so --

6 Okay. Other questions?

7 Okay. Let's move into the program --

8 Oh, we have another one?

9 MS. BARRETT: Yeah. Leanne Barrett from
10 Rhode Island, Kids Count.

11 I'm wondering if you can clarify this
12 question that's come up in our state recently about
13 school-age child care and programs serving school-age
14 children. Many of us -- we know this grant is for --
15 directed at birth to K entry, but many of us have
16 quality ratings systems in place that also serve
17 school-age child care programs, and there are family
18 child care providers who specialize in serving school-
19 age kids. So the question is can funding from the
20 Early Learning Challenge be directed to do quality
21 improvement activities at those kinds of programs?

22 MS. CARON: I'm thinking that's a question we
23 might want to talk about at the break or do we -- do
24 you have an answer --

25 MS. WEISS: So there's an invitational

1 priority that deals with this question of integrating
2 with early elementary school. And because it's an
3 invitational priority, what that means is it's not
4 going to be scored by the reviewers, so it won't count
5 toward the total number of points that you earn on your
6 grant, but you can describe what you want to do there
7 and allocate budget to it. So that's what it means for
8 an invitational priority to be in there. You could use
9 your budget for it. So yes, you can use that budget
10 that way if you choose to do so.

11 MS. BARRETT: So it sounds like there's no
12 restrictions on using funding for school-age child
13 care?

14 MS. WEISS: As long as you -- so you just
15 have to talk about it in that invitational priority and
16 describe what you're going to do, and then you can put
17 a budget against the work you've described there.

18 MS. CARON: And talk about it in relation to
19 your overall plan, yeah.

20 DR. LOMBARDI: You know, I just want to
21 reaffirm that and also say, you know, we know that
22 these quality rating systems are going -- of course we
23 don't want to do anything that would segment again
24 where we were. We want alignment, and where you put
25 the description is one thing, but of course the goal is

1 alignment.

2 MS. CARON: Yeah. Okay. Hopefully that
3 clarified.

4 So we're going to talk quickly about some
5 relevant program requirements. And again, the issue of
6 program requirements came up earlier. Just as a
7 reminder, there are application requirements which are
8 things you have to do in order to apply, things that
9 you have to have in place, things that need to be
10 included that are necessary for you to apply. There
11 are eligibility requirements that you have to meet to
12 be eligible to apply. There are program requirements
13 that are things that you are responsible for if you get
14 a grant after your grant continues. So there are a
15 number of those. We'll talk about some more of them
16 later on, but there are some that have budget
17 implications specifically, so we wanted to make sure we
18 highlighted them here.

19 So the first one is (b). There is a
20 prohibition for using any of the grant funds for direct
21 health services. So that's one way that you cannot use
22 this budget. The other one (c), is that we've asked
23 you to set aside money for technical assistance, and
24 this came up on the call that we got, that we had, and
25 we just want to clarify when we're talking about

1 technical assistance in this regard this is technical
2 assistance with the departments. ED and HHS want to
3 cull the knowledge that you all have and the
4 information that you've gained, the experience that
5 you've, you know, you've come through with this grant,
6 and we want to pull that together. We want other
7 states to be able to learn from what you've learned.
8 So we want this to have a large, you know, reach impact
9 beyond just each individual grant. So we want to pull
10 you all together at times and try to get folks together
11 and be doing some -- some combined problem solving and
12 that kind of thing.

13 So we will be doing some technical assistance
14 activities, and we want you to budget \$400,000 as your
15 minimum. That's across the four years. You decide how
16 you want to split that up. You decide whether you want
17 that all to exist with the lead agency, and the lead
18 agency funds all of the technical assistance for all
19 the participating agencies, or whether you want to
20 split that up across your participating agencies,
21 whether you want to split it up -- how you split it up
22 across the four years, and again, this is a minimum.
23 This is like -- if you look at it and say we can't get
24 much done with that; we want to include more; that's up
25 to you. This is like a minimum bar that we want to

1 make sure you set aside some of this funding to do some
2 technical assistance as a group among the winning
3 states so --

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you have a plan for
5 what those TA activities would look like, or can we
6 propose some things --

7 MS. CARON: Those are evolving, and if you
8 have ideas or you have thoughts we would certainly be
9 glad to hear them.

10 And just as a constant reminder, our Race to
11 the Top - Early Learning Challenge mailbox is always
12 live. So if you have thoughts, by all means send them
13 in but yeah --

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So could we -- in our
15 grant could we propose suggestions that would also
16 reach out to the other award winners?

17 MS. CARON: You're certainly free to do that,
18 yeah. Just make sure that you have set aside enough of
19 a budget to cover the kinds of things that the
20 departments will want to do. So in other words, if you
21 propose a lot of activities that eat up all of that
22 400,000 and then, you know, you can't do any of them
23 because you've budgeted that whole amount, and then we
24 have other ideas as well. So yeah, use your
25 discretion, but certainly if you have ideas put them

1 forth so --

2 We have a question in the -- oh, sorry, right
3 here and then in the back.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does the direct
5 delivery of health services preclude mental health
6 and/or developmental screens?

7 MS. CARON: I believe it does. I'm not -- we
8 might have to talk about --

9 Say again?

10 Not screening.

11 Screening is allowable. This is direct
12 delivery of services so --

13 You can use the funds for screening because
14 screening comes up in other places. So funding can be
15 used for screening. It can't be used for direct
16 service delivery.

17 Does that make sense?

18 I guess it might be that people are defining
19 things in different ways so that's hard to --

20 So Joan has an elaboration she can --

21 DR. LOMBARDI: Get corrected along the way.

22 We know that many programs are trying to
23 improve the quality of their service by having, you
24 know, mental health consultants. I think that's in a
25 different category of -- those are supportive services

1 to your workforce. And so, you know -- it's when you
2 take the child to the doctor and pay for the doctor's
3 visit that I think is, you know, an example of a direct
4 health service. But we know those supportive services
5 to programs around health and mental health are
6 critical, health consultants, health coordinators.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you talk about
8 that in relation to home visiting as well?

9 MS. CARON: Yeah, can you say more about what
10 your --

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sort of what -- is
12 there a line -- in terms of home visiting if it's done
13 by nursing agencies and medical professionals, is that
14 considered a direct service, or is it considered a
15 support service?

16 DR. LOMBARDI: And I'm watching to see if --

17 MS. CARON: Yeah, I don't --

18 DR. LOMBARDI: -- say this right. I mean if
19 you're -- there are places where they're outreaching to
20 programs, and they're using a home visiting approach to
21 do that to improve the quality of the program, maybe a
22 small provider. That's a quality enhancement is what
23 I'm assuming you're saying.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, I'm asking about
25 home visiting to a family or a child. Is that

1 considered a health service?

2 DR. LOMBARDI: And in what context in this
3 proposal are you requesting to know that?

4 MS. CARON: And I think the reason that this
5 clarification is being made is because the idea of this
6 program is not to provide funding to do the kinds of
7 health services -- things that you would be doing
8 anyway or to supplement because there's another -- you
9 can't -- this is -- you can't supplant the funds you're
10 using for something else as another part of the grant.
11 So I think it's really much more to the goal of what
12 are you talking about as your activity. Is this
13 something that you would be doing that enhances your
14 plan that actually helps move things forward? It's
15 really all -- it's got to be about your plan. So you
16 can't be using these funds to provide the kinds of
17 health services you would normally be providing to kids
18 and families anyway or even getting that out to more
19 kids and families because that's not the purpose of
20 this plan. You have to look back at the program goals
21 and what we're trying to do with this --

22 DR. LOMBARDI: But of course, there are
23 parenting supports that will be part of this --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, and we've been
25 doing a lot of integrated funding where we are funding

1 integrated bundles, so that will -- we'll have to
2 segregate this out if we grant -- if we work with those
3 agencies on that.

4 DR. LOMBARDI: I want further -- a further
5 question and I want to confer because I think this is
6 an, I think this is an important point.

7 MS. CARON: Yeah, and we'll talk some more
8 about -- yeah.

9 Okay. And then we have another question in
10 the middle here.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is kind of
12 related. What about in meeting the absolute priority,
13 promoting school readiness for children with high
14 needs, including kith and kin or family, neighbor as
15 you begin to think about (B), (C), (D), (E)?

16 DR. LOMBARDI: I don't have the exact wording
17 in place, but there is a reference to family, friends
18 and neighbor in the -- they're going to give -- in the
19 definition, I think it's in the, I think it's in the
20 family engagement section. I'll get you the right
21 citation and so --

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But the family
23 engagement is a -- one competitive piece, and a state
24 might not choose to do (C)(4)?

25 DR. LOMBARDI: That's correct.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But choose --

2 DR. LOMBARDI: Those are choices that the
3 state makes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But in other systems
5 like the quality rating or workforce --

6 DR. LOMBARDI: You know, I think the overall
7 goal should always be to tie things back to your plan.
8 So if in your quality rating system you're trying to
9 encourage family engagement as part of that, then tie
10 that into your plan.

11 MS. CARON: And I'm not sure we've got
12 clarity on the question. Maybe we can have you ask the
13 question again.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, I -- first I was
15 thinking specifically to QRS about family, friend and
16 neighbor, kith and kin. Could we target them for
17 improvement without including them in the rating
18 portion? But then after hearing the home visitation I
19 started thinking what about targeting kith and kin as
20 part of your priority for the entire state? Because if
21 you look at one of the definitions --

22 DR. LOMBARDI: Go ahead. The citation.

23 MS. RUDISILL: So the last thing you said
24 though made me pause. I was about to answer and -- I
25 mean I would note, although I don't want to answer

1 directly the question that you just said about if we
2 put them in the QRS but we don't rate them, I don't
3 want to address that because I'd have to think that
4 through, and you'd have to ask it again.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll wait until B.

6 MS. RUDISILL: But on the question about -- I
7 just want to note that the definition of early learning
8 and development program is pretty specific but because
9 we recognize that states might want to include a
10 broader array of programs in the definition, it says
11 that it's these folks that we've enumerated, but it
12 says, "including but not limited to," which we think
13 gives you some room to think about how you're going to
14 define it. It has to include the things we've
15 included, but we do say "not limited to," so that may
16 give you some room to think beyond folks that we've
17 included --

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But families are not
19 defined as educators in your definition?

20 MS. CARON: But in early learning and
21 development programs so that's the --

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

23 MS. CARON: -- there are programs that can go
24 beyond the ones that are listed. But again the idea
25 here is about quality and improving quality, high-

1 quality opportunities for young children. So if
2 there's ways in which families and kith and kin fit
3 into that, that's what you would describe, and that's
4 what you would put in your plans.

5 MS. RUDISILL: Yeah. I also want to note
6 that the definition of early childhood educator says,
7 "including but not limited to." It does use the word
8 "professional" because that's where we're aiming.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. It does,
10 right.

11 MS. RUDISILL: But so there's room in there
12 for you to think about that. But that implies payment
13 to me. But you know, but including but not limited to
14 gives you some room there to think how you want to go
15 beyond.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's very helpful.
17 Thank you.

18 DR. LOMBARDI: You know, I just would also
19 add that, you know, this is a birth to five program,
20 and we know that many, many infants and toddlers are in
21 a range of environments and that if we want to promote
22 school readiness we have to think about where they are
23 and try to improve the quality of their experience. So
24 I just want to continue to point that out.

25 MS. CARON: And we have a question over on

1 this side?

2 DR. LOMBARDI: And, and --

3 MS. CARON: Oh, sorry.

4 DR. LOMBARDI: And the citation that I was
5 looking for is -- Shannon was mentioning the
6 definition. But under (C)(4), and we'll be talking
7 about (C)(4) later, if you just note that promoting
8 family support also is -- family, friends and neighbors
9 are referenced there.

10 MS. CARON: Go ahead.

11 MS. HAWLEY: Theresa Hawley.

12 I have a question about the \$400,000 for
13 technical assistance. Do you have a recommendation on
14 like what line of the budget that would go under?

15 MS. CARON: There is a special line just for
16 the technical assistance. It's actually line --

17 MS. HAWLEY: Okay. So we don't have to
18 specify like that's travel or personnel or any of those
19 other kind of things?

20 MS. CARON: Yeah. Oh, it's not showing up
21 on -- yes, it is. It's line 12. It says that's the
22 funding set aside for technical assistance.

23 MS. HAWLEY: Okay.

24 MS. CARON: So you would put it right in
25 there. So all of your technical -- and part of that

1 can be travel money, of course, but that's the set
2 aside just so that it's easy for the reviewers to see
3 that you have actually set that money aside.

4 MS. HAWLEY: Great. Thank you.

5 MS. CARON: Do we have other budget
6 questions? Anything else coming in from the regions?

7 MS. ONUNAKU: Yes. There's a -- so there's a
8 question about -- okay. So there's a question that
9 reads -- this is from Chicago. "Is there a non-
10 supplementation provision in the RTT-ELC grant, and so
11 the answer is that the Race to the Top - Early Learning
12 Challenge grant must be used to supplement and not
13 supplant funds.

14 MS. CARON: Right, right. You cannot
15 supplant existing funds using these grant funds.

16 Okay. So there are other questions from the
17 regions that are coming up later, so we'll address
18 those later.

19 Do we have any other issues?

20 We have one more here. Okay. Can we get a
21 mic up in front?

22 Thank you to our mic runners. They're doing
23 a great job.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If we are -- I know
25 there's not a match requirement but if -- when you're

1 talking about existing resources that you're going to
2 turn to the work of the grants, if you're using current
3 state employees to do that in addition to people you
4 hire, would you include those personnel costs?

5 MS. CARON: Yeah. I had to double check
6 that, but yes, you would.

7 Okay. All right. Well, then it looks like
8 we are a couple of minutes ahead of schedule, which is
9 phenomenal, which means you get an entire hour for
10 lunch. Before we let you go I just want to give you a
11 quick -- sorry guys. They're like we're out of here.
12 Just a quick -- this is actually good news. This is
13 like fun stuff. Just to give you some food options
14 there's a piece of paper in your binder, if you didn't
15 already see it. You might want to just go outside and
16 warm up.

17 Wait, we got one more question?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We just want to read
19 one more question and answer that came in a while ago
20 from the region.

21 MS. CARON: Okay. Sorry. We got one more
22 question from the region. We're trying to be
23 responsive to the folks who couldn't be here so --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So we're going back a
25 little bit when we were talking about the section on

1 past record of investments in state early learning and
2 programs and the tables. So this question is from Chad
3 in Boston. "Massachusetts funds whole programs, not
4 pre-K, whether public, center based or family
5 providers. Is it appropriate to include any dollars
6 that are allowed to be used on three- and four-year-old
7 children as part of state pre-K funding?"

8 And your answer is, "Chad, we understand your
9 question to be whether you should list on the table
10 dollars that are spent on threes and fours on the state
11 pre-K line or on another line on the table. Yes, you
12 should include investments for threes and fours. You
13 should decide where to list on the table -- you have
14 some different options there -- and explain that in
15 your narrative.

16 "And Chad, if we didn't get to your question,
17 please shoot us an email and provide further
18 clarification."

19 MS. CARON: Okay. And just wanted to -- oh,
20 no. Just wanted to let you know that there are a
21 number of food options, even though it's kind of late
22 in the day for most of you for lunch, but you're
23 starving. There are some food trucks, so those of you
24 who aren't familiar with food trucks because you come
25 from places where that's not new, it's a brand-new

1 phenomenon here in D.C., and it's taking off. It's all
2 the rage. So there are actually trucks that come
3 around and have hot food that they have cooked up.
4 There's an Ethiopian one that's supposedly delicious.
5 There's one that does like mac and cheese. There's a
6 couple of other ones, so they're all out front. We
7 called them especially for you.

8 So it's safe to eat these. These are all
9 well regulated, safe to eat. This is not like -- yes,
10 thank you. So for those of you who haven't come across
11 this, it's really kind of a neat opportunity.

12 We also have a couple of sandwich shops right
13 across the street, and we have a cafeteria in the
14 building that has Subway sandwiches and I don't know
15 how much else.

16 And we will start promptly at 2:30, so please
17 come back and get your seats before then.

18 (Off the record at 1:30 p.m.)

19 (On the record at 2:30 p.m.)

20 DR. JONES: We're going to start with some
21 answers to some questions that we didn't quite get to
22 earlier. So Jennifer and Beth are going to start. So
23 we're starting, guys.

24 Okay. Go ahead.

25 MS. CARON: We hope you all had a chance to

1 warm up a little bit. We're going to see what we can
2 do about the temperature in here so -- and for the
3 transcriber this is Beth talking. So we're going to
4 try to remember to use our names so the transcriber can
5 catch it all for the transcript.

6 I just want to point out we got a couple of
7 questions already about the application submission and
8 actually writing this all out and submitting it, and
9 we'll have a whole section on that later. So hold
10 those, and we'll come back to them.

11 We also got a number of questions around
12 (A)(4) which is the table (A)(4) -- I'm sorry, (A)(1)-4
13 which is about putting in all your state dollars. And
14 several people asked about whether that should include
15 federal dollars, and it should not include federal
16 dollars. The point of that table is for you to
17 describe the investment that you've been making as a
18 state in early learning and development. So it's state
19 funds. We want you to put those state funds in there.

20 There may be cases where you have one really
21 large locality and something special happening there
22 that you really want to highlight. There's nothing
23 that precludes you from adding a line and putting that
24 in there and explaining it. You know, that's up to you
25 to do, but the point of this table is really your state

1 funds.

2 There were also some specific questions about
3 if you had a state that looked like this and had a
4 local match about that, and we're not going to -- we're
5 not telling you how to go into detail about what's
6 specific in your state. We can't be that state
7 specific in our answers. But again, think of the
8 context of (A)(1)-4 which is about showing the
9 investments that you've been making over the past, you
10 know, five years about early learning and development
11 in your state so --

12 MS. TSCHANTZ: And we had a couple more
13 questions that came in from the regions around
14 (A)(1)-4. That table seems to be generating a lot of
15 questions. And the question was how do SFSF and other
16 funds get counted? And again, just as Beth said, that
17 table should focus on state funds, on what you guys
18 have in the state.

19 And a couple other questions around that.
20 Someone asked about if they could report actual amounts
21 and percentage of the budget in those -- in that table
22 and that's fine. You can add percentage. Just be sure
23 that you have reported what we've asked for there, so
24 give us the actual budget amounts, and then in painting
25 your picture if you think it's helpful you can add

1 percentages.

2 Oh, the same person asked about 4 --
3 Table (A)(1)-4. The state fiscal year 2011 has closed
4 and final expenditures are known, and they asked if
5 they could give us the final expenditures in that
6 table, and the answer is yes. If you know it for 2011,
7 feel free to put that in there. Otherwise, you know,
8 we were thinking that most states would just put
9 appropriations. But if you have final numbers for any
10 year, include those in the table.

11 MS. CARON: Okay. So we got a question from
12 Region 5 which is about -- I'll just read the question.
13 It's easier.

14 "Will preference be given to states that have
15 an overarching governance structure, e.g., an office of
16 early learning, in a department of state education, for
17 instance, versus a coordinated governance across
18 multiple agencies?"

19 The selection criteria that you're answering
20 here, (A)(3)(a), is about your governance structure,
21 your organizational structure. We're not specifying,
22 the criterion does not specify what kind of a
23 governance structure you have, and the reviewers will
24 be reviewing it and evaluating it against that
25 criteria. So you decide and you just describe that for

1 the reviewers.

2 MS. TSCHANTZ: Right. And we had one, I
3 think it's Glen Price looks like the name, about one of
4 the eligibility requirements, eligibility requirement
5 number 3, and they say, "If the state is developing a
6 strategy and a plan for a TQRIS, would a commitment to
7 that plan be sufficient?"

8 And that's where you all are going to --
9 everybody is going to sign on that they agree to use
10 common this, common that across the state, and clearly,
11 yes, that is sufficient depending on where you are in
12 your state. If you already had a TQRIS that was up and
13 running, then they would be signing on that they would
14 be adopting that.

15 We also had some questions, this one came
16 from Oregon, around independent evaluators. "Are we
17 required to have an independent evaluator, and if so,
18 what are the components of the evaluation?"

19 So we're going to talk in just a minute,
20 we're going to start talking about Criterion (B), and
21 under I think it's (B)(5), we talk about validating
22 your TQRIS, and we'll get into more details, but we do
23 talk about an independent evaluator there, and we'll
24 share some more details on that piece in just a minute.

25 And then just also a note that underneath the

1 program requirements there is a requirement that if
2 you're funded you'll participate in any evaluations
3 that ED and HHS sponsor.

4 MS. CARON: Okay. We got a question from
5 Region 5 also. "How should a state handle situations
6 where an approach is innovative and not standard
7 practice?" And there's a little bit more elaboration
8 there, but I just want to let you know that in general
9 we're definitely encouraging innovation here, but you
10 need to be responsive to the criterion. The criterion
11 is what the reviewers are going to be looking at, so
12 you know, obviously innovation is going to be key to
13 getting a lot of this done. But you need to make sure
14 you're responding to the criterion as you do it. And
15 use your best judgment. Make your best case, and use
16 your judgment.

17 MS. TSCHANTZ: That seems like advice I want
18 to give my kids, right? Use your best judgment.

19 We are -- this question -- I can't
20 remember -- it came from Region 7 looks like. "We are
21 currently not serving children through" -- all right,
22 my HHS friends, make sure I get this right --
23 "maternal-infant early childhood home visiting" -- I
24 got it -- "funding, but we do know the numbers planned
25 for implementation. Should these numbers be included

1 in Table (A)(1)-3?"

2 And yes, the answer is yes. You definitely
3 want to include those numbers, and just indicate on any
4 of the tables, that bottom row is a place for you to
5 explain any of your data that you're presenting above,
6 and that goes across all of the tables. So you would
7 just indicate that these are not actual data, but this
8 is what the state plans, the number of kids we plan to
9 serve in the coming years.

10 Then we had another question, "Do we need
11 MOUs for Head Start collaboration office if our office
12 is located at a university, not a state agency?"

13 And the response is yes, since the Head Start
14 collaboration office is one of those entities that
15 we've listed under the definition of "PSA," the
16 participating state agencies, so yes.

17 MS. CARON: This one references a question
18 that you have, they said. They think you have question
19 number 5 --

20 MS. TSCHANTZ: Oh, yeah. There's the
21 question.

22 MS. CARON: Okay. So the question is sources
23 of funding. "Would the funding listed here" -- and I
24 am not sure what here refers to -- "be those that are
25 not listed on page 30? Would CCDF be included here?"

1 I think we have to look to see which table
2 that is referring to. Oh, it's (A)(1)-4 again. We'll
3 have to get to that one because they're asking what the
4 definition of "other" is. So I need a little more
5 context for that one.

6 Okay. "How many states are applying?" we
7 actually had someone ask, but we do not know how many
8 are applying, and we won't know until October 19th
9 which is when all of you will know as well. We had 37
10 states submit nonbinding letters of intent to apply,
11 but those are nonbinding, so some of those states may
12 not apply, some may, so we don't know how many will end
13 up --

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- 43 are
15 participating --

16 MS. CARON: Yes, and there's 43 participating
17 in either on-site here or on one of the regions so --
18 what's the next question?

19 Oh. Someone asked a question about if you're
20 doing a pretty good job on something now will you get
21 rated lower. And we think that refers to the question
22 of the quality and the implementation and how those two
23 things align. And you're not going to get rated lower
24 by -- just because of, you know, that you're already
25 putting something in place. The idea is are you

1 putting -- do you have something in place that you're
2 implementing, and you can show that you're doing it
3 with quality. They're going to be looking -- the
4 reviewers will look at the quality of that and the
5 level of implementation. So it's those two things
6 connected to one another that matter, and that's what
7 reviewers will look at. So we just wanted to clarify.

8 Okay. "For the TA set aside, should the
9 states provide any narrative for expected TA needs or
10 leave the entire set aside for federal determination?"

11 That's again up to you. We want you to set
12 that money aside, but we're not telling you you have to
13 describe how it will be used. You can say here's
14 \$400,000 set aside for TA for federal technical
15 assistance, and that's all you need to say. If you
16 want to describe something that you have in mind, then
17 as we said earlier, you're welcome to do that.

18 Okay. This is a follow-up from earlier. "If
19 the state preschool is funded via the school funding
20 formula, should fiscal data include the local match
21 required by the local communities?"

22 And again, this is a state-specific question
23 and that's -- you have to figure out what makes sense
24 in your state and describe that for your reviewers.
25 We're looking at state funds and how the state funding

1 affects what you're painting as a picture, so you have
2 to decide if you need to describe that extra piece and
3 go into detail, put that in your footnote.

4 MS. TSCHANTZ: All right. And I think we're
5 probably going to stop now. We have some additional
6 questions. One more? Okay. You want to do the
7 governors? And then we're going to switch over to
8 selection Criterion (B).

9 MS. CALDERON: Thank you. We had a question
10 this morning from Pam in Oregon, or we received a
11 question from Pam in Oregon.

12 "We are confused about lead agency. Oregon
13 has a statutory ELC which the governor has designated
14 as lead. This ELC is attached to the Executive
15 Department which is not one of the required agencies.
16 Is our ELC executive department as fiscal agent
17 acceptable as a lead agency?"

18 The answer is yes, a governor's office can be
19 designated as the lead agency depending on the
20 situation in your state. We want to make sure that we
21 clarify a response given earlier this morning related
22 to this question. A governor's office can be
23 considered a PSA, a participating state agency, if the
24 office administers public funds related to early
25 learning and development and is participating in the

1 state plan. The defined term for a participating state
2 agency is useful here. The definition provides
3 information on who is required as a participating state
4 agency and leaves open other entities that can be
5 considered as a participating state agency. And
6 finally, we want to point out that it might also be
7 useful to see the relevant questions and answers in the
8 FAQ document, specifically A-1, B-3 and B-4.

9 MS. TSCHANTZ: Great. Thank you, Miriam. I
10 just want to say how much fun it is to be working as a
11 team, and we all take turns, and it really works
12 nicely.

13 So Shannon Rudisill and I are now going to
14 jump into Section (B), the selection criteria that
15 focuses on the tiered quality rating and improvement
16 system. And I'm Jennifer Tschantz by the way. Sorry.
17 We're all just jumping in here trying to help out
18 without introducing ourselves. And I'm here at
19 Education and I work on our early learning team.

20 And Shannon, for those of you who don't know
21 Shannon, is the director of the Office of Child Care at
22 HHS.

23 So Section (B) is really about how a tiered
24 QRIS system will be developed across all of the state's
25 agencies and programs with a goal of having common

1 quality definitions and metrics used statewide. There
2 are five different -- or five different criteria under
3 here and this is -- these are core areas, and so you
4 must write to all of these and address all of these.
5 And collectively it's worth up to 75 points.

6 Before -- whoops. We're no longer at the
7 lunch break. There we go.

8 Okay. Before we jump into Section (B), we
9 wanted to walk you through the definition of a tiered
10 quality rating and improvement system. And I'll be
11 referring to this as the TQRIS. The definition can be
12 found on page 19 of your application, and really this
13 system is supposed to be about evaluating the quality
14 of early learning and development programs as well as
15 including components about supporting programs to
16 improve their quality. And remember we are talking
17 about a single TQRIS system to use across all of your
18 programs statewide.

19 There are four major components to a TQRIS,
20 the tiered program standards that include multiple
21 rating categories for each -- that really meaningfully
22 differentiate levels of quality as you go up, and we're
23 not articulating how many levels there need to be or
24 what specifically needs to be in each of those levels.
25 That's for you all to figure out and tell us or tell

1 the reviewers. And so we'll talk more about those
2 program standards in just a minute.

3 The second piece is that monitoring piece.
4 So what are the mechanisms in place to monitor programs
5 on their quality? The third piece is the supports. So
6 what are the mechanisms you have in place to support
7 programs, to improve their program quality over time?
8 Things such as technical assistance, training and other
9 fiscal pieces. And then the quality ratings that are
10 public, so that transparency piece. And we also want
11 to articulate, and we're going to talk about this in
12 (B)(5), that there's a mechanism in place to validate
13 your TQRIS system.

14 So (B)(1) is about establishing those common
15 tiered program standards. These program standards are
16 the basis of your TQRIS and focus all of the areas that
17 we all know are critical to the quality of early
18 learning and development programs.

19 First we have early learning and development
20 standards, and in the program standards you would talk
21 about how these are implemented through activities,
22 interventions, curricula, with the focus being on how
23 you're going to go -- how programs should be going
24 about improving kid outcomes.

25 A comprehensive assessment system is the

1 second piece under the program standards. And these
2 are, you know, used to improve instruction and enhance
3 program quality.

4 The third one is about the workforce and the
5 workforce qualifications, clearly very important to
6 program quality.

7 And the fourth is about engaging families and
8 having a set of standards that talk about how families
9 can -- how programs can work with families to better
10 engage and support their children's development.

11 Health promotion is the fifth piece that goes
12 from anywhere from the basic kind of health and safety
13 standards to moving forward to talk about developmental
14 screenings that we talked about earlier and promotion
15 of physical activities and healthy eating habits.

16 The final one should focus on data practices.
17 So what are the standards that you could develop to
18 encourage programs to use data on a regular basis to
19 improve instruction, their approaches and overall
20 program effectiveness? You're going to want to pay
21 close attention to definitions. If you notice here
22 there are a lot of terms that are in initial caps, and
23 we encourage you to take a look at those. Underneath
24 program standards, each of these is spelled out in more
25 detail, and we're also going to talk about these later

1 as they come up, and there is a clear relationship
2 between these and some of the focused investment areas.
3 So we'll get to those.

4 Finally, the last thing I wanted to say about
5 (B)(1), it also actually just shows that your TQRIS is
6 based on standards that are clear and measurable,
7 really meaningfully differentiate levels of program
8 quality, reflect high expectations of program
9 excellence that are consistent with nationally-
10 recognized program standards, and links to state
11 licensing or for state program licensing.

12 We have -- up here is the list of evidence --
13 yeah, question. Great.

14 MS. MATHIAS: Deb Mathias. Linked to state
15 licensing systems, one of our next steps is to figure
16 out programs that aren't linked to state licensing and
17 how to bring them in. So does this mean that this only
18 relates to licensed programs? I don't think that's
19 what you meant, right?

20 MS. TSCHANTZ: No. So it's really just how
21 the system that you're developing, this TQRIS, how it
22 links to the state licensing system. So does it and
23 then how does it?

24 Anything else?

25 Great. Did that help?

1 MS. RUDISILL: The only thing I would add is
2 you mean -- you'll note that the word "linked" leaves
3 room for a variety of, you know, interpretations, but
4 this is an opportunity for you to demonstrate for the
5 reviewers how it's linked, but they're -- we're placing
6 a value here on it being linked.

7 MS. TSCHANTZ: Great. Question up front?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On page 46, item C,
9 does the term "licensing" as referred to that page mean
10 all programs need to go through the state's licensing
11 process, or is regulation through a government entity
12 sufficient?

13 MS. TSCHANTZ: So it's page 46 --

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Page 46, item C.

15 MS. TSCHANTZ: Oh. So this is the same
16 question about the TQRIS being linked to state
17 licensing. So we're not saying here that every program
18 has to go through licensing. It's just how is your
19 TQRIS linked to state licensing?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. TSCHANTZ: You need a microphone in the
22 back?

23 MS. RUDISILL: You'll notice there are
24 several places, as we move through the rest of B, where
25 we're placing value on enrolling the licensed programs

1 in your state in QRIS. You're setting targets that
2 include that. I mean that's clearly contemplated as
3 part of what you are writing to throughout the rest of
4 the section.

5 MS. TSCHANTZ: There's a question in the
6 back?

7 MS. JONAS: Yeah. Deborah from Virginia.

8 Are you going to speak to each of the program
9 standards and their definitions individually moving
10 forward today? Because I have a question about one of
11 them, and I just want to wait if you're going to talk
12 more about --

13 MS. TSCHANTZ: You said the different types
14 of program standards?

15 MS. JONAS: The six listed on this slide.

16 MS. TSCHANTZ: So we are going to talk more
17 in depth when we get to the sections in the focused
18 investment areas that relate to them. But if you want
19 to raise your question now you don't have to wait until
20 we get --

21 MS. JONAS: I just -- in looking at the
22 definition of a comprehensive assessment system within
23 the program standards, I wonder if you're going to
24 provide or can provide more information on screening
25 measures and formative assessments specifically in --

1 for children birth to five and I ask -- and I'm now --
2 have even greater question because when you talked
3 about the health promotion standard you talked about
4 developmental screenings in that standard. So I
5 wondered -- prior to you saying that I wondered if that
6 would be part of your comprehensive assessment system
7 and how you viewed that because it's really connected
8 to lots of pieces in this application, and so I would
9 like, if possible, more clarification.

10 MS. TSCHANTZ: Right. So yeah, so you're
11 finding the interrelatedness of all these different
12 pieces and how they fit together is quite complex, and
13 we are going to talk more in depth. Jacqueline is
14 going to come back and talk about the comprehensive
15 assessment systems in depth and kind of what that
16 entails. So I think your question will be answered
17 there, so hang on to that one.

18 Anything else before we move on?

19 Great. So on to the evidence. I'm not going
20 to specifically walk you through the evidence. I just
21 wanted to raise an issue and clarify that underneath
22 the second bullet here we're requesting that you submit
23 a copy of your program standards if your state already
24 has them in place along with supporting documentation.
25 And reviewers are not actually going to review and

1 evaluate your program standards. Instead what they're
2 going to look at is the documentation that you provide
3 that shows the extent to which your standards meet the
4 elements that we have outlined here in the criterion.
5 So that's a little bit different but just wanted to
6 make that clear. And reviewers could then look back at
7 your program standards just to kind of consistently
8 look at the evidence and make sure that it's consistent
9 there.

10 Question over here? Oh, Beth has something
11 to add?

12 MR. HAGGARD: Dan Haggard from New Mexico.

13 In that regard, how is that applied to the
14 page limitations?

15 MS. TSCHANTZ: So the page limitations are
16 guides only, and so your program standards would most
17 likely you could refer to that and have it in an
18 appendix in the back, which would probably make the
19 most sense. But just remember they're all guidelines,
20 the page limitations.

21 MR. HAGGARD: So they're not, they're not
22 definite part of that --

23 MS. TSCHANTZ: Right. They're not binding.
24 They're just our recommendations.

25 MR. HAGGARD: Okay.

1 MS. CARON: And we got a question from
2 Region 3 on program standards. In the application
3 there's a place where we talk about a common set of
4 program standards that are used statewide, and the in
5 another place in the application it talks about
6 consistent and demanding statewide program standards.
7 Those are the same thing, and we're talking about
8 wherever we talk about the program standards being
9 statewide, and obviously we're looking for standards
10 that would be, you know, consistent and demanding. So
11 in both of those instances we're talking about the
12 same -- a common set of statewide program standards.

13 MS. TSCHANTZ: Great. Okay. So I'm going to
14 move on to Table (B)(1)(b), and this is another piece
15 of evidence that will be part of your response to
16 (B)(1). And similar to all those status tables, those
17 13 status tables that you're going to fill out in
18 (A)(1), the purpose of this one is to capture where
19 your state is relative to program standards right now
20 so that the reviewers can better understand where your
21 state is starting and where you want to go. So
22 hopefully that's pretty clear and once you get more
23 comfortable with the programs.

24 Okay. I'm going to hustle up here because
25 I'm starting to run out of time. (B)(2) is about

1 maximizing participation in the TQRIS among the
2 different early learning and development programs in
3 your state. Applicants need to discuss their approach
4 to reaching a goal of having all publicly-funded
5 programs in the TQRIS, including those funded by the
6 state, by Head Start, IDEA, Title I, CCDF.

7 As noted earlier, for programs that provide
8 services to some children in the home, so for example,
9 early Head Start, the home-based model, or Part C where
10 programs are serving many families and children in the
11 child's home, participation in the TQRIS may not be
12 appropriate. However, we'll encourage you to include
13 the center-based models and those programs that are
14 serving kids through the center-based.

15 Under (B)(2) you also --

16 You want to add something? Go ahead.

17 MS. RUDISILL: Yeah. So I want to be clear.
18 Not just center-based but also family child care. So
19 what we're talking about --

20 MS. TSCHANTZ: Right.

21 MS. RUDISILL: -- the distinction we're
22 making is not between services in a home. It's
23 services in the child's home --

24 MS. TSCHANTZ: Child's home.

25 MS. RUDISILL: -- like home visiting. Family

1 child care, we've gone to as many pains as we could to
2 have fully incorporated throughout.

3 MS. TSCHANTZ: Thank you, Shannon. Very
4 important.

5 I thought there might be some question that
6 came up. Mics up front, please?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you speak to
8 that -- can you speak to the definition of early
9 learning programs that includes folks who may not be
10 regulated, the family, friend and neighbor stuff and
11 the link to licensing standards that's part of this. I
12 thought I heard earlier -- this has been a question
13 that's been circulating for us. I thought I heard
14 earlier that even if we didn't include non-regulated
15 programs in our QRIS, which we do not, that if we were
16 addressing some of those realities in other parts of
17 the application that might be okay. But is there --
18 and I don't know how many states this applies to, but
19 in terms of our statutes around the licensing, we
20 regulate after two families, not two kids. So that for
21 us is a whole other population of people who are
22 legally operating.

23 So if you could speak to that a little bit
24 because that feels like a dilemma for me, and maybe
25 it's not.

1 MS. TSCHANTZ: Go ahead. Yeah.

2 MS. RUDISILL: So I think we'll address this
3 when we get to the competitive priority which I'm going
4 to go over in a minute. So I mean the general thrust
5 of the competition that we're trying to get to is
6 covering more kids with health and safety standards and
7 also covering more kids with standards that go beyond
8 health and safety standards, especially kids with high
9 need, and getting into higher and higher levels of
10 quality. So I think that, you know, I can't tell any
11 particular state how they would show that they're doing
12 both of those things. But we did make space
13 specifically culled out in the application for you to
14 speak to those. Especially when we get to the
15 competitive priority, you'll see there we talk about
16 points, a few points because it's a competitive
17 priority, for getting licensed and covering more folks.

18 But in many other parts of the application
19 we're talking about just getting the reach of your
20 quality standards across, you know, as many programs as
21 you feel that you can feasibly do. And here you can
22 see there's even a little bit of another spin which is
23 if there's public dollars going in, that gives us
24 another reason to be interested in you pulling those
25 programs under high quality.

1 So I don't think that there's any conflicts
2 here. I think that in general the move is toward more
3 programs covered -- more kids with health and safety
4 insured and more programs covered by quality standards.
5 And you know, I think that's the consistent theme here.
6 How you write to it is going to be your opportunity to
7 tell your story.

8 MS. TSCHANTZ: Great. And I'm going to move
9 us on for a minute and -- because I've got the red
10 light flashing at me. I'm the first presenter to have
11 the red light flashing. So hang on to your questions
12 and let's -- let me finish up (B)(2), and then Shannon
13 will get up here and talk a little bit more. But I
14 think all of these questions that you're having are
15 going to -- some of them will be answered as we
16 continue to present, and then it may get more complex
17 as we present more information. So hang on to your
18 questions.

19 Just wanted to point out in (B)(2) that there
20 is a performance measure. Joan in her presentation
21 this morning talked about the term ambitious yet
22 achievable. So whenever you see ambitious yet
23 achievable targets, that's a performance measure.

24 And just a real quick -- we have a slide in
25 the webinar on Sept. 1st, but it's just really

1 important one that we wanted to highlight again.
2 Performance measures include goals, annual targets,
3 baseline data and other information. Where performance
4 measures are required we've put the tables right in the
5 application, and they follow where you would put your
6 narrative, so you'll see them there.

7 Reviewers will consider as part of their
8 evaluation the extent to which the state has set
9 ambitious yet achievable annual targets for the
10 performance measure which means that they're going to
11 be looking for how you connect the plan in your
12 narrative with kind of the goals that you're setting in
13 the performance measure. Are you being ambitious with
14 what you're attempting to do? You know, are you
15 setting that high bar, and are you also being realistic
16 in proposing a plan to achieve that, and have you
17 balanced kind of that ambition with achievement
18 successfully and thoughtfully?

19 And again, Joan mentioned this before, but
20 when you set these targets you will be held, you know,
21 if you are successful in getting funding, we will be
22 looking at those as we monitor and look at the grant
23 proposals, so set them in a realistic but ambitious
24 way.

25 And here is the actual performance measure

1 table. Whenever you see performance measure tables, be
2 sure to fill in every single cell that you can, and we
3 realize that in some of these tables you may not have
4 actual baseline data, and it is okay to put estimated
5 baseline data. So just be sure that again on that
6 bottom row with the table to explain how you estimated
7 your baseline data.

8 And then I just wanted to point out the
9 second column here in this slide the number of programs
10 in this state. This is the number for each of the
11 different types of programs, so it's not the number,
12 the total number of programs in your state would go in
13 there.

14 And with that, hang on to your questions, and
15 I'm going to turn it over to Shannon.

16 MS. CARON: While Shannon sets up, I'm going
17 to take the liberty of asking a question and answering
18 it from one of the regions. This is from Region 2 and
19 it's about Table (B)(1). This is the table that asks
20 you to fill out the current status of all of your
21 program standards in the state, and they asked how you
22 answer what you fill out in the first column which is
23 the early learning and development standards. So if
24 you have early learning development standards in your
25 state, that's where you're going to describe that. Go

1 to the definition of each of those, and you're going to
2 describe and you're going to fill that table in based
3 on your standards.

4 MS. RUDISILL: Okay. All right. So we're
5 going to keep moving through (B) which is the TQRIS
6 section. I thought it would be helpful to say a couple
7 of other sort of introductory words about the TQRIS.
8 First of all, we're calling it a TQRIS. I may call it
9 only a QRIS because I may not have fully made the
10 mental switch in the language yet. Some of you may be
11 asking what's that T? Where did it come from? Does
12 that mean something new? I think what we're trying to
13 do here is we're trying to be more descriptive. We
14 thought that word was very descriptive, especially when
15 we're talking cross-sector with people who might not
16 have encountered these before. And as far as I know,
17 all the QRIS's we've ever had included tiered
18 standards, and so it should not be unfamiliar. We're
19 just pulling that language over.

20 The other thing is you heard Jennifer talk
21 about four elements. If you've ever seen any of the
22 many, many presentations by Office of Child Care our TA
23 [technical assistance] providers, we typically have
24 talked about five elements, and you might be wondering
25 about that. But I would say that all of the same

1 elements are there. They're fully compatible. When
2 we've enumerated them before, we broke the support
3 element into two sections, training and technical
4 assistance and financial, and here they're collapsed.
5 So there shouldn't be anything here that's not, you
6 know, consistent with what you have seen before on
7 those things. So I just was going to sort of head off
8 questions by addressing those.

9 So (B)(3) is about how the state will rate
10 and monitor program quality. It's worth up to 15
11 points. And so what we're doing here is we're asking
12 you or applicants to discuss rating and monitoring in
13 terms of the tool you'll use, how you'll train the
14 monitors, the frequency at which programs will be
15 monitored and anything else you think would lead
16 reviewers to look at, you know, the fairness,
17 credibility of your system.

18 Additionally, applicants will describe how
19 they make rating and licensing information available to
20 families and the public because transparency is such a
21 hallmark of what we're doing here. So those are the
22 things that we're looking at here.

23 It seems like this is a good point to mention
24 that sustainability was one of the budget items that we
25 talked about back in (A)(4), and obviously when you're

1 getting into a monitoring regime like this one of the
2 things you might want to think about is how you'll
3 sustain that after the end of the grant period.

4 All right. So for this one, for (B)(3),
5 there's no specific evidence and no specific
6 performance measures, so you'll address it in the
7 narrative. And my colleagues who worked more on this
8 application and provided some helpful guidance here.

9 This is a good time to remind you that there
10 is a text box for every criterion, and you can type
11 right in there. You enter your -- you can enter your
12 response directly in the application. It's standard
13 Microsoft Word. You can download it from the website.
14 And you know, I think we've talked about this a couple
15 times today but just to say that the page limits, so
16 here you see the recommended maximum. That's not a
17 binding limit. It's simply a recommendation. But you
18 know, remember the reviewers will appreciate brevity,
19 and I've been thinking a lot about attention disorders
20 lately so, you know, they might have more attention if
21 you cut it shorter.

22 Deb.

23 MS. MATHIAS: When we submit this do we --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: State your name,
25 please.

1 MS. MATHIAS: Deb from Pennsylvania. When we
2 like are submitting this, do we take out all the other
3 verbiage and just like leave that header and those
4 eight pages? We're just not quite sure --

5 MS. RUDISILL: Jennifer, Beth, you want to --

6 MS. MATHIAS: The -- like there's 100 pages
7 of verbiage here.

8 MS. RUDISILL: Right.

9 MS. MATHIAS: Like do we take all this out
10 except for those five pages?

11 MS. TSCHANTZ: So go ahead and leave it in
12 there, and those five pages are your response. So the
13 instructions and all that other information does not
14 count up to your response. But leave it in there so
15 that it's clear kind of where it all fits.

16 Anybody else have anything?

17 MS. RUDISILL: A lot of murmuring. Anybody
18 want to do a follow-up before --

19 MS. TSCHANTZ: Oops. I might -- hang on a
20 second. More information.

21 MS. WEISS: I think all we want, all we
22 wanted to add to that was if for your purposes you'd
23 like to delete, you know, the instructions and all some
24 of the up-front stuff, you're welcome to. Do not
25 delete the criterion. Think of your reader. Your

1 reader has to read this in context. So don't delete
2 the selection criterion that you're responding to, or
3 your reviewer will not be a happy person, and that will
4 not be in your best interest.

5 But if you want to delete the instructions at
6 the beginning and, you know, all that kind of stuff,
7 you're welcome to do that if it makes you happy to do
8 it, or you can leave it in if you want to. Up to you.

9 MS. MATHIAS: So it might actually be like
10 250 pages of the actual proposal and then 150 of --
11 okay.

12 MS. RUDISILL: Okay. So criteria (B)(4),
13 this is about promoting access to high-quality early
14 learning and development programs for children with
15 high needs. This is really where we're getting at our
16 ultimate goal, so this is the exciting part for us.
17 It's worth up to 20 points, and it has a couple parts
18 that I want to point out.

19 So the first part is about policies and
20 practices that states have put in place to promote
21 continuous improvement for programs. So this is where
22 I was saying before sometimes we've broken it out.
23 Here we've put training, technical assistance,
24 financial incentives all together. In the webinar we
25 got a question about do I have to do this particular

1 kind of support? And you know, these are examples.
2 You'll have your own plans, but we wanted you to know
3 what we were thinking when we wrote policies and
4 practices, so we put in some examples here. It's for
5 you to decide how you want to do it and what you want
6 to do in your state.

7 The second part is about helping working
8 families who have children with high needs access high-
9 quality early learning and development programs. This
10 is, you know, obviously for Office of Child Care this
11 is a big one for us because we have working families
12 with children with high needs, and you know, we put
13 again examples of what we mean here, full-day, full-
14 year, transportation, other kinds of things that could
15 help us reach more families who are working. Again,
16 those are examples.

17 There's performance measures in this section,
18 and Jennifer just did a really nice job of describing
19 in great detail how to think of the performance
20 measures. But we're going to look at each of these
21 separately. I'll notice that there's that ambitious
22 yet achievable language again, and Joan covered that
23 this morning.

24 Okay. So the first one under (B)(4), the
25 first performance measure is about increasing the

1 number of early learning and development programs that
2 are in the top tiers of the QRIS. Really all the
3 tiers, but we're looking toward getting people into the
4 top tiers. So this means you're going to have to
5 customize this table. All right. So we thought about
6 this. You can go in. You're going to need to define
7 what your tiers are. You're going to need to name
8 them, and you're going to need to give the reviewer
9 some context because we recognize that every state is
10 different. Standards are different. The levels are
11 different. So you know, this is a place where you can
12 really customize.

13 The other thing which I wouldn't have thought
14 of, but one of our colleagues did, you're going to want
15 to be sure that reviewers know what's high and what's
16 low, right, because depending it may not be so obvious.
17 So -- and like with the table that we just went over,
18 you might want to think about whether your baseline
19 data is actual or estimated. Be sure that you indicate
20 that. You might want to tell us how your data is
21 collected. I believe those are noted here as little
22 reminders for you, too, some of these things.

23 And you know, a question has come up too in
24 our internal discussions. We anticipate, especially if
25 you look at the slides that Jennifer covered, about

1 the -- how many different components your program
2 standards have, that some of you might be proposing to
3 modify your existing QRIS to come closer to some of the
4 criteria that were outlined there. And there was a
5 question about well, what if we're in the process of
6 evolving, like we're flying the plane, you know, while
7 we're building or whatever that metaphor is. And so,
8 you know, we'd encourage you to just describe that.
9 Describe how it's evolving and what you're doing.

10 And you know, some folks have said well, is
11 it two QRIS's like 1.0 and 2.0, and how does it fit in
12 with the tables? Don't -- I wouldn't go -- think about
13 who's in your QRIS and then describe how, you know,
14 you're bringing folks in, how it's evolving, how it's
15 improving, when you're going to be meeting your
16 timeframes for getting that done and how that's going
17 to work.

18 The second performance measure is about
19 increasing the number of children with high needs who
20 are in the, who are in the highest-quality programs,
21 and that involves top tiers. Here this means that
22 you're going to have to describe and probably justify
23 what you consider to be top tiers. You know, I think
24 that that's up to you. You'll need to describe it to
25 the reviewers. Folks may have different ways of

1 looking at that. And again, it's sort of the same
2 situation as the previous table, baseline data and
3 targets by type of early learning and development
4 program and talk about whether your baseline is an
5 estimate or an actual.

6 Okay. Validating the effectiveness of the
7 QRIS. So this is the final point here under B. This
8 is up to 15 points. And so we're asking you to look at
9 a couple of things here in your validation. First,
10 whether your TQRIS truly represents -- whether the
11 tiers truly represent different levels of quality and
12 the extent of which moving up in the quality rating
13 through your tiers are connected to improved outcomes
14 for children. There's an option here. You could do
15 this with an independent evaluator or as part of a
16 cross-state evaluation consortium.

17 You know, I think somebody alluded to this
18 earlier when we talked about the technical assistance.
19 The reason we're interested in this is because we're
20 building our knowledge base as a field. We've all had
21 these questions. We've been working through it. We
22 know many of you have as well, and we think that every
23 state and territory will benefit, you know, whether you
24 win or not if we're using this grant to build our
25 overall knowledge base. So that's what we're trying to

1 do here.

2 Kelly has a question up front, so we need a
3 mic.

4 Oh, wait. Okay. Dan has the first mic which
5 is good because Kelly is a researcher, and now I'm
6 worried about this. Okay.

7 MR. HAGGARD: I understand what you mean by
8 the external evaluation. I don't understand what you
9 mean by the alternative.

10 MS. RUDISILL: So a state has an opportunity
11 to enter into a cross-state consortium. I don't know
12 how to elaborate on that. I think you could propose
13 that you're going to do this work as part of a cross-
14 state consortium.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But it has to be --
16 the state's agreement.

17 MR. HAGGARD: For evaluation?

18 MS. RUDISILL: Right. Yeah. Exactly. I
19 mean so there would be some sort of methodology or
20 something. There would be agreement on that.

21 Joanne, you want to describe it a little
22 more?

23 MR. HAGGARD: I don't understand it in terms
24 of an evaluation of effectiveness. I understand the
25 outcome for the kindergarten outcome assessment but

1 this -- I'm understanding external evaluation of how
2 children are doing and whether they're benefitting
3 and --

4 DR. JONES: So let's make a -- if I can, make
5 a distinction between program evaluation, the overall
6 evaluation of the effectiveness of everything you've
7 done, and the validation of the effectiveness of the
8 state tiered quality rating and improvement system.

9 MR. HAGGARD: So you're talking more about a
10 process evaluation?

11 DR. JONES: So here we're talking about
12 whether or not these differentiated tiers really do
13 tell us something different about the quality of the
14 program, about how children are doing. This is not the
15 overall program evaluation. This is looking
16 specifically at your quality rating and improvement
17 system and trying to look at those tiers and whether or
18 not those are meaningfully differentiated tiers and
19 whether or not the top tier really is the most
20 effective.

21 I mean do you understand what I'm saying? Is
22 that not -- yeah, because I don't think I'm answering
23 your question or giving you much satisfaction here.

24 Can we make that -- can we agree to make that
25 distinction between overall program evaluation and the

1 validation of the tier and the quality rating and
2 improvement system? Is that -- can we go there?

3 MR. HAGGARD: I think so.

4 DR. JONES: So --

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How could multiple
6 states collaborate on --?

7 DR. JONES: Okay. I'm being asked if you're
8 asking whether or not multiple states can come together
9 on this piece of the validation.

10 MR. HAGGARD: No, that really wasn't my
11 question.

12 DR. JONES: Okay.

13 MR. HAGGARD: You're talking about -- are you
14 talking about a statistical validation?

15 DR. JONES: Yeah. We're -- statistical.
16 We're talking about a way -- a research-based --

17 MR. HAGGARD: Making sure that it's, making
18 sure that it's valid and --

19 DR. JONES: -- way of looking at validating
20 this. So there --

21 MR. HAGGARD: -- valid and reliable.

22 DR. JONES: -- are validation studies that
23 get done, and that's a technical term, a validation
24 study. And --

25 MR. HAGGARD: And that it's --

1 MS. RUDISILL: But we're not prescribing the
2 methodology. That's up to you to come up with the most
3 persuasive --

4 MR. HAGGARD: So you're talking about --

5 MS. RUDISILL: -- one for the reviewer.

6 DR. JONES: But it is a -- but it will be a
7 validation.

8 MR. HAGGARD: About the rating being
9 statistically valid and reliable data and -- so there's
10 inter-rater reliability --

11 DR. JONES: About the ways in which the
12 tiered levels of the rating system actually
13 differentiate quality and performance of children.

14 MR. HAGGARD: Okay.

15 MS. RUDISILL: Which Dan I think the thing
16 you were mentioning at the end there goes back to I
17 think it was (3), right, which is whether or not when a
18 reviewer goes out and performs a monitoring visit that
19 they get a result that, you know, is valid and that
20 another reviewer would have seen the same thing and all
21 that. So that stuff is contemplated more in (3),
22 (B)(3).

23 MR. HAGGARD: Okay.

24 MS. RUDISILL: Okay. Kelly.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, Kelly Maxwell.

1 Want to introduce yourself -- okay.

2 MS. MAXWELL: Oh, Kelly Maxwell from North
3 Carolina.

4 When I read (B)(5)(b) I can interpret that a
5 couple of different ways, and I'm wondering if you
6 could tell us a little bit more about how you intended
7 it to be interpreted.

8 MS. RUDISILL: My answer, I don't know, is
9 that we intended it to be able to be interpreted in
10 different ways and for states to make their best case
11 that you have a way of knowing that as people move up
12 to the highest levels of quality you're seeing
13 connections and changes in children's learning and
14 development --

15 DR. JONES: So all of our work in improving
16 the quality of programs, increasing access to high-
17 quality programs to children -- especially children
18 with high needs is in the service of children doing
19 better, being better prepared for not just kindergarten
20 but for school and for life. And so we really are very
21 concerned that we have some data that tells us the
22 extent to which these changes and these quality ratings
23 really are helping us to understand children's learning
24 and outcomes. So I mean that's what we're --

25 MS. RUDISILL: So -- but there's a reason why

1 we didn't prescribe one statistical link we're looking
2 for. I mean there's a reason. You know, so we left it
3 to be are related to, and you have various research and
4 evaluation capacities and things you've been engaged in
5 for you to be able to try to prove to the reviewer that
6 getting to the top tiers of your system is making a
7 difference for kids.

8 MS. MAXWELL: But is that meaning changes in
9 the sense of there are different associations between
10 quality and child outcomes at a four and five versus a
11 one and two, or are you taking the perspective of --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

13 MS. MAXWELL: -- if I'm a program and I
14 change my levels over time, then my children have
15 better outcomes?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So the former is
17 closer to where we are.

18 MS. MAXWELL: Thank you.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah -- I mean that's
20 what we're looking at. If you've -- if you're at a
21 high level, is that -- are children doing better? If
22 you've got a three-tiered system at a level three, are
23 kids doing better when they enter kindergarten? Are
24 they doing better beyond?

25 We're not telling you the methodological

1 approach. We're telling you that this is what we'd
2 like to see.

3 JILLIAN: I'm Jillian from the governor's
4 office in Wyoming, and I have a question on the -- I
5 like the idea of a multistate consortium but without
6 knowing if area states, Wyoming is pretty rural, you
7 know, really a consortium would make the most sense
8 with states with similar demographics, perhaps or maybe
9 even the same type of TQRIS, but without having that
10 knowledge before the grant application is submitted, I
11 guess is that okay? Or do we need to enter into some
12 type of MOU or agreement prior to submitting?

13 MS. RUDISILL: You know, I think we would go
14 back to the factor that the reviewers are going to
15 judge how credible your evaluation plan is, so that's
16 not something we could comment on. They'll have to see
17 whether or not it looks like you have a plan that's
18 going to be feasible and be able to be carried out.
19 The high-quality plan language is here, so it's a high-
20 quality plan to design and implement evaluations. And
21 so the reviewers will make that determination.

22 JILLIAN: Okay.

23 MS. RUDISILL: Okay. Oh, sorry, we have one
24 up here.

25 KAREN: Hi. Karen from Michigan, and I

1 actually have a question about (B)(3) and monitoring
2 and accountability assessment. And so what is the
3 acceptable level for inter-rater reliability? I'm
4 hearing a lot of different percentages, and I'd like to
5 hear it from you. Do you have one?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're not going to
7 hear it from us. I mean that's part of your plan and
8 what you decide to present to the reviewers.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There was a
10 question --

11 MS. CARON: So we have a couple questions
12 from the regions I want to --

13 MS. RUDISILL: Okay.

14 MS. CARON: -- take real quick. So this is
15 from Paul in Oklahoma. "If we expect to create higher
16 tiers under the grant, how would you like us to show
17 percent of children in higher tiers? E.g., right now
18 75 percent of programs may be tier two of three. Our
19 goal might be 50 percent in tiers three, four, five of
20 five."

21 So I think again that's up to the individual
22 state and kind of your state context and kind of where
23 you are now and where you want to go, and this is where
24 you want to be really explicit in your narrative and
25 talk about it so that the reviewers understand kind of

1 where you're moving.

2 MS. RUDISILL: And Beth, I would say not only
3 in the narrative but part of the reason the tables are
4 so customizable is there could be ways to modify that
5 table to show those targets going out too, right?

6 MS. TSCHANTZ: Right. Exactly. Thanks,
7 Shannon.

8 And a couple other questions from the
9 regions. "There's a question around program standards
10 seem to be stated in several ways in the application
11 and must be agreed to in the MOU. Was it intended that
12 the term program standards is solely the criteria of
13 the state QRIS?"

14 So wherever we refer to program standards
15 it's referred to as in the initial caps, and look to
16 the definition in the definitions section.

17 And then the question is, "Must it include
18 the A through F items specified in the definition of
19 program standards."

20 Yes. So we walked through those definitions,
21 those different pieces, A through F, underneath program
22 standards, and they should include all of those
23 elements.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I just clarify
25 that? So these are selection criteria. So it's not

1 that it -- it's not that the program standards must
2 include everything in the definition. It's that the
3 reviewers are going to look to see whether you have
4 included everything in the definition. You can choose
5 not to and be explicit about it and try to explain why,
6 but those are the standards the reviewer is going to
7 use to judge. It's not like it's a requirement, you
8 know, for eligibility or to have your application
9 judged, but that is what the reviewers will be looking
10 for.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So just to highlight
12 this difference, while it is the extent to which you
13 have these elements the reviewers will be looking for
14 these elements.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So it's a question in
16 the back.

17 MS. SUTTER: Okay. I have two. One is about
18 the standards. On Table (B)(1)-1 where you ask the
19 state to list out the program standards, within our
20 state in D.C. we have a tiered quality improvement
21 system. There is a set of program standards. But
22 there are other sets of standards that apply to
23 different early learning programs. So in here are we
24 listing out the QRIS standards which are also going to
25 be attached, or are we listing these programs take part

1 in the QRIS. These programs are part of the charter
2 accountability plan. These states are part of these
3 other standards. Which of those are we doing?

4 MS. TSCHANTZ: So again the purpose of this
5 one is the status on where your state is and trying to
6 tell the reviewers kind of where is your state on
7 program standards? How many different sets of program
8 standards currently exist? So you want to explicitly
9 list out all of the different sets of program standards
10 in your state. And then you would talk about in your
11 plan how you're going to bring all of that together.

12 MS. SUTTER: Great. The second question is
13 about the validation and then the correlation because
14 that's the way I'm thinking about it in my head between
15 (a) and (b) there that this is the -- (a) is the
16 validation of the tool, and so that could be done with
17 or without existing data on ratings because it's the
18 validation of the tool and the way the standards are
19 set up within tiers. But (b) requires data, and it
20 requires student outcome data. Is it student outcome
21 data from the comprehensive assessment systems within
22 QRIS participating programs, or is it data from a
23 kindergarten entry assessment?

24 MS. TSCHANTZ: You know, I think this is
25 where I go back to my previous answer which is the

1 wording that we chose here are related to progress in
2 children's learning development and school readiness
3 were left for you to come up with the best evidence
4 that you have which can consist of various data sources
5 in your state to say that higher quality is resulting
6 in greater school readiness.

7 MS. WEISS: But you're thinking of this
8 correctly when you talk about the sort of validation
9 and then the correlation. So that's a good way to
10 think about it --

11 MS. SUTTER: Okay. And it has to take place
12 within the bounds of the grant, so it would have to
13 take place by the close of the grant period which would
14 mean data that you have, in order to be evaluated by
15 the time your final grant report is due.

16 MS. RUDISILL: Okay. Does anybody have a --
17 we have a question in the front, but I don't know if we
18 have --

19 DR. JONES: We have a couple from the regions
20 if we --

21 MS. RUDISILL: So you want to read the region
22 one?

23 DR. JONES: Okay. Here's one from -- if your
24 current QRIS does not comprise all of the TQRIS
25 elements currently, do you include the number of

1 providers and children that are currently in the system
2 as the baseline for your tables in (B)(4), or is the
3 baseline zero?

4 MS. RUDISILL: So this is what I was trying
5 to address. So the baseline is the number that are
6 currently in there. However, we think that you should
7 describe where your TQRIS is now and where it's headed,
8 and depending on the changes you're making, that could
9 be reflected in different parts of (B) or in a way you
10 described the tables.

11 MS. CARON: Okay. And we have another one
12 which we started -- we hit on earlier. This is from --
13 I'm sorry, I don't know which region it's from. "How
14 can Part C be part of the QRIS?"

15 And I think that's what we were saying
16 earlier, that there may be some programs like a
17 center -- a home-based program that may not really be
18 appropriate to include in your QRIS, but you may want
19 to include them in other aspects of your plan.

20 MS. TSCHANTZ: And I would just add to that,
21 you know, looking at those program standards and having
22 conversations with the Part C folks about which of
23 those things are relevant might be something you want
24 to explore.

25 We also have a question around "The term

1 voluntary is not used in the description offered by
2 TQRIS. Is that to be interpreted as meaning that the
3 TQRIS is mandatory and states can require participation
4 as a condition of receiving CCDF, Head Start, pre-K?
5 If so, how does that support parent choice?"

6 So the first part of that question I think I
7 would go back to what Joanne is saying is that none of
8 this is mandatory. Again it's, you know, you're
9 painting the picture of the extent to which you're able
10 to reach and set some achievable targets for getting --
11 maximizing the number of programs that are receiving
12 public dollars in the system.

13 MS. RUDISILL: On the second part of the
14 question, specifically with regard to CCDF, the Office
15 of Child Care this past year released some guidance
16 around requiring programs receiving subsidy to
17 participate in a QRIS, and the answer is it depends
18 because there is parental choice that needs to be
19 preserved. So if you're interested you can look for
20 that, I think we called it a policy interpretation
21 question, on our website, and it will describe sort of
22 the bounds around requiring folks who get CCDF to
23 participate in a QRIS with a lot of cautions about how
24 you would need to maintain parental choice if you're
25 pursuing that policy.

1 MS. WEISS: So we have a question from
2 Region 2 in New York. Back to Table (B)(1)-1 which
3 lists -- which asks -- which provides multiple lines to
4 list for each of the different program standards which
5 programs are using what standards. And it says
6 multiple lines suggest that the inclusion -- suggest
7 the inclusion of multiple standards. Should our
8 application discuss each of these in our table,
9 licensing standards, QRIS standards, early learning
10 standards, Head Start standards?

11 I think this is similar to a question that we
12 keep getting, so I want to just like come up a level
13 and make sure that everybody understands that this
14 particular table that asks you to list all these
15 different standards, it's because we know today that
16 most states don't have one common set of standards. So
17 this notice is asking you to move toward commonality,
18 and the particular table that's confusing everybody is
19 really trying to say what does it look like today so
20 that as the reviewer is reading your application they
21 know where you're starting from and then what your plan
22 is for moving somewhere else.

23 So in general when we talk about a TQRIS, as
24 Shannon said in the beginning, we deliberately didn't
25 use exactly the same word you guys are already using,

1 QRIS, because we really might mean something different
2 depending on how you're defining that term and using
3 that today. We wanted to make sure that you were
4 understanding that this is the quality rating and
5 improvement system that's tiered, that meets all the
6 things in the definition, and that everyone's going to
7 move to in common in the future. And so we're trying
8 to just provide anchor points today and where you're
9 going so that the reviewers, as they read your
10 application, can understand what you're proposing based
11 on where you're starting.

12 So I can sense this is confusing, so keep
13 asking questions if we're not hitting on answers for
14 you yet.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's a very patient
16 person here.

17 MS. SIDDENS: Hi. This is Stephanie Siddens
18 from Ohio.

19 Just -- on page 46 on (B)(1) you refer to
20 tiered program standards, and I want to make sure I
21 understand tiered program standards versus tiered
22 quality rating and improvement system. Is the
23 expectation that the standards themselves are tiered,
24 or could it be that program standards are at a certain
25 high level of quality, set highest level, and then the

1 rating system itself is what tiers programs reaching
2 that standard? If -- does that make sense I hope?

3 MS. RUDISILL: I think that's just two ways
4 of saying the same thing. That's --

5 MS. SIDDENS: Well, so you could --

6 MS. WEISS: It's two different approaches to
7 get there, and either approach is okay.

8 MS. RUDISILL: Yeah, that's right. I think
9 that's right. That's a better way of saying it.

10 MS. HAWLEY: Theresa Hawley. Am I correct in
11 understanding in performance measure (B)(4)(c)(2) that
12 it really is only asking about of those kids who are in
13 programs how many of them are in the top tiers of
14 quality, and there is no performance measure around?
15 Of your total number of high-needs kids, how many of
16 them are in high-quality programs?

17 MS. RUDISILL: So --

18 MS. HAWLEY: It's a little confusing what the
19 denominator is.

20 MS. RUDISILL: Right. So I would say a
21 couple things. First, that first column is the way
22 I've interpreted -- Jennifer, I'm looking at you
23 because you're the table queen -- to say this is how
24 many kids we have enrolled, for example, in these
25 different programs, and of those --

1 MS. HAWLEY: Assuming we'll keep that number
2 enrolled over the entire period of the grant then.

3 MS. RUDISILL: And that also goes back to
4 (A). That is why (A) was really about setting the
5 context for the state, and there were places in (A)
6 where you talk about in general not connected
7 necessarily to programs, how many kids have high needs
8 in your state? So that, you know, both of those things
9 factor into sort of how well are you doing at the goal
10 of getting more high-needs children into higher
11 quality.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And so to ask your --
13 answer your question, I mean clearly the number of kids
14 being served in each of these programs is not a
15 constant thing so, you know, we recognize that. So
16 this table is asking you, you know, today, based on
17 who's enrolled today make, you know, talk about your
18 baseline data about which of those kids are in these
19 higher qualities, and then set your targets based on
20 that.

21 But we -- yeah, but we know there's no way
22 that you're going to keep enrolling the exact same
23 number of kids every single year.

24 MS. MATHIAS: Deb Mathias, Pennsylvania.

25 Even though you do have IDEA Part C in this

1 table, it may or may not be appropriate that you would
2 see a rise in children in your TQRIS from Part C over
3 time?

4 MS. RUDISILL: That's right. I mean it's
5 going to depend on your state and your context and how
6 children are served and kind of which models they're
7 being served on. And so that would be something that,
8 you know, again use that box on the bottom and your
9 narrative to talk about that.

10 MS. CARON: Okay. And here's one from Kara
11 in Oregon. She asks -- oh, this is back to Table
12 (B)(2)(c), licensed child care providers, how are they
13 represented in the state's performance measures? So I
14 think that she's asking do they get listed as other in
15 that table, in (B)(2)(c). And she also asks for
16 clarification on programs receiving CCDF funds in that.
17 So it's in (B)(2)(c).

18 MS. RUDISILL: So I think that programs
19 receiving CCDF funds are programs -- I'm not sure.
20 They're programs receiving CCDF funds. Either they're
21 caring for, they're caring for a child whose care is
22 partially or totally being paid for with CCDF funds,
23 and I would say in terms of -- which this is a nice
24 segue to the competitive priority. In terms of showing
25 progress on enrolling more licensed programs, you could

1 use that other box. There's one place if you wanted to
2 demonstrate progress on that.

3 Beth are we -- yeah, move on? Okay.

4 And Kara, if that didn't answer it, you could
5 email more with a clarification.

6 Okay. Another question over in the back.

7 MS. GRACE: Cathy Grace, Mississippi.

8 I think the term's been interchangeably used
9 in terms of enrolled and served. We have a state that
10 reports out what a center is licensed to enroll which
11 may not be the number they're serving. So I --

12 MS. RUDISILL: So where are you referring to
13 it that --

14 MS. GRACE: -- when -- a while ago when the
15 discussion was about the number of children served, so
16 that's the same thing as the allowed -- the number for
17 total enrollment if it's --

18 MS. RUDISILL: I don't think so. It kind of
19 sounds like the context but --

20 MS. GRACE: That's what I'm trying to, that's
21 what I'm trying to figure out here in terms of the
22 difference. If you're a center that's licensed to
23 enroll 250, but there may be served -- there may be 220
24 that's served, but it comes and goes throughout the
25 year, the constant is the 250.

1 MS. TSCHANTZ: So I think it depends
2 specifically on where you're talking about. But most
3 of the tables are getting at served, and that's why at
4 different points in time we've said okay, we understand
5 it changes, but we're talking about now. Or I think in
6 the -- on some of the Education Department programs
7 they have a -- what is it, the December 1 count or
8 something? So I mean that's why we tried to be
9 specific about where you would take that snapshot in
10 time. If you have a specific place you're looking, and
11 you think that enrollment is more what is meant, point
12 us there and we'll look at it.

13 DR. JONES: And I'm going to push us along a
14 little bit. We're starting to -- the questions are
15 great, but we want to be sure that we have enough time
16 to kind of give you the content and we've -- we have
17 like a big chunk of time hopefully at the end where
18 we'll be able to bring back. So hold the rest of your
19 questions so far and write them down. Don't forget
20 them. And we're going to keep moving through.

21 MS. RUDISILL: Okay. Thanks.

22 Okay. So I think this actually ties back to
23 some of the things we've been talking about, and that's
24 competitive preference priority 2. So we purposely
25 wanted to close the TQRIS portion of the presentation

1 by talking about competitive preference priority 2. So
2 if this is a new concept for you all as it was for us
3 at HHS, it's worth mentioning that there are two
4 competitive preference priorities. They're numbered 2
5 and 3. We're going to talk about 3 in a minute. The
6 reason why there's no competitive preference priority 1
7 is because 1 is the absolute priority that Joan already
8 talked about this morning.

9 So the intent of competitive preference
10 priority 2 is to encourage states to bring as many
11 early learning and developments as -- programs as
12 possible under licensing and under the TQRIS standards.
13 You can choose to write to this for extra points. It's
14 on page 72 in your application. It's worth up to
15 10 points. Reviewers will award between zero and 10
16 depending on your response, and if you go back to the
17 earlier session on the scoring, this is the quality and
18 implementation rubric. So that's why we had this
19 deadline here of June 30th, 2015, an opportunity to put
20 in a high-quality plan. They're going to be looking
21 not just at today but also at your implementation
22 strategies.

23 There's two parts, (a) and (b). The first
24 part is about bringing programs into the licensing and
25 inspection system. Specifically we're encouraging

1 states to bring into licensing, programs that regularly
2 care for two or more children who are unrelated to them
3 for a fee in a provider setting. So not in the child's
4 home but in the provider's home. If the state
5 currently exempts programs for reasons other than the
6 number of kids, there's numerous exemptions if you look
7 at the licensing study, but we're not asking the state
8 to change those exemptions. It's really we're trying
9 to get at more coverage based on number of kids. And
10 we wouldn't count exempt programs when we say all
11 programs.

12 The reason we're interested in this is
13 because we're trying to look at the total system of
14 care, and when we're looking at a system of bringing
15 kids in quality care, if we have folks who are shining
16 in some of the areas -- other areas, but we have sort
17 of like -- I think of it as the hole in the bottom of a
18 bucket, if we haven't really looked at shoring up basic
19 health and safety for all of the kids, we wanted to be
20 sure that we had acknowledged the importance of that
21 within the competition, and this was our way of doing
22 it through the competitive preference priority.

23 The next part I think goes to the -- links
24 back to the question that we were just talking about
25 which is -- and then, you know, this goes to the

1 linking with the licensing. There's points here to be
2 earned for linking your TQRIS system by how many
3 licensed or state-regulated early learning and
4 development programs are participating in it. So we're
5 encouraging you to bring all licensed or state-
6 regulated programs into the TQRIS. So that hearkens
7 back to that link. So there's like I said 10 points,
8 it's optional. It's for, you know, bonus points, and
9 they would review it based on the quality and
10 implementation rubric.

11 DR. JONES: Questions?

12 Okay. So we're headed onto the focused
13 investment areas. And before we jump into the focused
14 investment areas, I just want to see if we can make
15 some connections. Clearly there's planned redundancy,
16 and you will see in the focused investment areas the
17 areas that we outlined in the program standards.
18 You'll see comprehensive assessment systems, health
19 promotion practices, family engagement and the like,
20 all of which are represented in (C), (D) and (E).

21 In these areas you have the opportunity to
22 select the areas where your state could most benefit
23 from additional work, and you'll earn points on the
24 fundamental elements that are the underpinnings of a
25 high-quality tiered quality rating and improvement

1 system. States are all at very different places, and
2 we recognize that, regarding the solutions that you've
3 selected to address standards and data and the like.
4 And so the flexibility to address whichever focused
5 investment areas make sense to you, lets you take into
6 account where you are right now and build a plan for
7 those areas in which you think you have the highest
8 potential for impact across the state.

9 So it's slides 75 and 76 here. Seventy-six
10 is (C) promoting early learning and development
11 outcomes for children. This is the first one of our
12 focused investment areas. It's worth up to a total of
13 60 points. And as I said earlier, all of the work
14 we're doing to improve the quality of programs, to
15 increase access to high-quality really is in the
16 service of making sure that children are doing a lot
17 better. And so the first focus area (C) targets early
18 learning and development outcomes, comprehensive
19 assessment systems, health promotion and the like.
20 Here you are choosing at least two areas where you want
21 to do additional in-depth work.

22 Remember that you provide a rationale, as
23 Joan talked about earlier this morning, in (A)(2) for
24 which of the criteria in (C) you're choosing to
25 address. So you're going to provide the rationale in

1 (A)(2) for what happens in (C). The rationale may be,
2 for example, that your state is really strong in some
3 areas, and therefore you'll focus on other areas to
4 broaden your impact. Or it may be that your state has
5 a strong foundation in some areas, but you have to go
6 deeper in those areas, take them to a new level in
7 order to have a meaningful impact. Or it may be that
8 some areas are prerequisites for other work you plan to
9 do so that you have to get those done to enable other
10 activities.

11 The bottom line here is that there is no
12 right or wrong answer. And it's incumbent upon you to
13 present the most compelling rationale for high impact
14 in -- clearly in (A)(2) and then follow up with action
15 in Sections (C), (D) and (E). Please understand that
16 the departments are in no way promoting one area over
17 another, one criteria over another. That is not what
18 we're saying. We're saying these are important. We
19 know it. We know you're in different places. But how
20 you decide is really based on what you think is state
21 specific and will really provide the biggest impact.
22 No promoting one area over another.

23 Section (C) is worth up to a total of
24 60 points, and the amount of points available for each
25 criteria will depend on the number of criteria you

1 choose to address. So if you're writing to two in (C),
2 each will be worth up to 30 points. If you're writing
3 for three each will be worth up to 20 points. And if
4 you're writing for four, each will be worth up to
5 15 points.

6 So we want to make sure that you don't think
7 that you have to write to as many as possible. Just
8 let me write to lots and lots of them, and therefore
9 I'll do a lot better. That's not the intent here.
10 Rather, we want you to be very, very thoughtful about
11 what you need in your state and respond to the criteria
12 again as you feel you'll have the highest impact.

13 So let's take a closer look at each of the
14 criteria under (C). Seventy-seven. (C)(1) is about
15 building out your early learning and development
16 standards. If you choose to address this criterion,
17 you'll be asked to describe the early learning and
18 development standards that you're creating or building
19 upon. You'll provide evidence that the standards will
20 be developmentally, culturally and linguistically
21 appropriate for young children across each of these age
22 groups, including English learners and children with
23 disabilities. They'll cover all the essential domains
24 for learning. I'll walk through those in a minute.
25 That there will be aligned to the state's K-3 academic

1 standards. That they'll be incorporated into other
2 critical components of the state's early learning and
3 development programs such as program standards and
4 assessment systems. Additionally, you'll describe how
5 to promote understanding and adoption of these early
6 learning and development standards across all programs.

7 So we have a defined term, and there are two
8 defined terms in this criteria that I'd like to
9 discuss. The first is early learning and development
10 standards. We've talked about this already. The
11 definition emphasizes the most important aspects
12 outlined in criteria (C)(1) including that these
13 standards cover children from birth through
14 kindergarten entry; that they need to be
15 developmentally, culturally and linguistically
16 appropriate; and that they address all children
17 including English learners and children with
18 disabilities.

19 So the standards must also address all
20 essential domains of school readiness. And you'll
21 notice that thanks to our nifty initial caps technique,
22 this is also a defined term. And I think -- did I move
23 it? Okay. It didn't move. I can't tell what's moving
24 and what's not moving.

25 The definition of essential domains of school

1 readiness outlines the areas of development and
2 learning that we believe are linked to later school
3 success. And for those of you who are old enough and
4 remember the National Goals Panel a long time ago,
5 these should be rather familiar. Only one brave hand
6 went up but I know that -- I can tell.

7 We quite intentionally -- we're quite
8 intentionally encouraging states to move beyond just a
9 focus on literacy and numeracy when it comes to school
10 readiness and to include language and literacy
11 development, cognition, general knowledge, math,
12 science, approaches to learning, physical well being,
13 social, emotional development. And so the essential
14 domains of school readiness are important to (C)(1) and
15 also to (E)(1) for the kindergarten entry assessment.

16 So for the evidence for (C)(1), several
17 pieces of evidence that you are required to submit if
18 you choose to write to this criterion. Applicants are
19 expected to submit their state early learning and
20 development standards as part of their response to
21 selection criteria (C)(1). States are also expected to
22 submit documentation that their early learning and
23 development standards are developmentally and
24 linguistically, culturally appropriate -- you're
25 getting a trend here -- for all children, that they

1 address all the essential domains of school readiness
2 and are of high-quality and align to the state's K-3
3 academic standards.

4 The peer reviewers will focus their
5 evaluation on the documentation that's submitted by the
6 state. Reviewers can refer to the actual early
7 learning and development standards as needed to confirm
8 the documentation that's provided. But please note
9 that the departments will not review or approve the
10 content of the states' standards. Keep in mind that
11 the -- of the -- keep in mind the defined terms because
12 reviewers will be looking for the elements of these
13 defined terms, as we said, when they review your
14 evidence.

15 Okay. Yeah. I knew it. Yes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The evidence --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Please state your
18 name. Thank you. And we're getting a mic. Thanks.

19 HARRIET: Harriet from Connecticut.

20 The evidence for (C)(1) asks that you have
21 documentation for high-quality early learning
22 standards. So we are asking what types of
23 documentation is expected. Is it -- and how will the
24 reviewers determine high-quality early learning
25 standards? Do we have to validate them? Is there some

1 kind of checklist? Do they have to be NAEYC
2 documented?

3 DR. JONES: So again, remember earlier this
4 morning I said we weren't giving you information on the
5 specific content of your application. So this is for
6 you to tell us what is good documentation of these
7 standards. You are to provide this for us and build
8 the strongest case you can that your standards meet
9 these criteria.

10 So we're saying submit the standards. Our
11 reviewers will not be evaluating the content of those
12 standards. They'll be looking at the documentation
13 that you use which will be your best effort to tell us
14 how they meet the elements that we require.

15 Is that -- does that help?

16 Okay. Any others? I have -- at this point,
17 you know, there are reading glasses and there are
18 seeing glasses. These are the reading ones so if
19 you're -- if you got to -- I have to have motion at
20 this point in my life.

21 So let's get to the fun part, the
22 comprehensive assessment systems. Everybody's been
23 waiting breathlessly for this, right?

24 So states that choose to write to (C)(2) will
25 be focusing on implementing a developmentally

1 appropriate comprehensive assessment system by working
2 with programs, by working with programs to choose
3 appropriate assessment tools and approaches to
4 understand the different purposes and uses of the
5 components of the comprehensive assessment system. And
6 that's 82.

7 The notion of a comprehensive assessment
8 system is an important one that we believe will move
9 the field forward on implementing assessments and
10 understanding children's learning and how programs are
11 progressing. The definition articulates that it is
12 not, it is not a single assessment. Rather, it's about
13 organizing the various assessment tools you have in a
14 manner that provides information about both the process
15 and context of young children's learning and
16 development and that enables professionals to use this
17 information in order to make informed instructional and
18 programmatic decisions. This is about information.
19 It's about understanding how children are doing. It's
20 about understanding how programs are doing.

21 At a minimum, the state's comprehensive
22 assessment system should include screening measures,
23 formative assessments, measures of environmental
24 quality and measures of the quality of adult-child
25 interactions. Please note that each type of assessment

1 is again a defined term, and you should refer to these
2 for more important and clarifying information.

3 Okay. I'm ready. Questions. If there's not
4 one question, I will be so disappointed. I don't
5 believe it.

6 You have one.

7 MS. CARON: From Region 7? Sorry. And I
8 just want to read it so we get it clear.

9 The question is, the request is in
10 identifying the elements of a comprehensive assessment
11 system required for programs, what if the state is
12 using certain assessments in a voluntary way with sort
13 of a pilot group in their state? Do they actually fill
14 out the checkbox in the table that says yes, I actually
15 am using the -- I'm trying to summarize for you to make
16 it quicker, but it's not working. In the table they
17 want to know if they should put a checkbox that the
18 comprehensive assessment systems are being implemented
19 in their state. But if they've only -- only doing it
20 in a pilot way this would probably be a good place for
21 them to make a note in the table --

22 DR. JONES: Exactly.

23 MS. CARON: -- and explain we're using it in
24 a pilot way in these places we don't have this fully
25 implemented. We're not fully doing this throughout the

1 program.

2 DR. JONES: And use that as a rule of thumb
3 so that if there are places in our tables where you
4 have to say well, I don't know how this really fits;
5 I'm doing something a little different; tell us. Make
6 a note. Make sure you use an extra line, and explain
7 to us what's happening in your state. I think one of
8 the most difficult and challenging things about this
9 competition was the realization that states are in so
10 many different places, and you've all done such
11 extraordinary work but different kinds of work, so we
12 don't expect everything to look the same. So use these
13 kinds of challenges with the tables to tell us exactly
14 what you're doing. So as Beth has said, I think a note
15 about that would be just fine.

16 Going once, going twice?

17 MS. CARON: Regions.

18 DR. JONES: Good. So many regions.

19 MS. CARON: We got one from Chicago. "Are
20 the reviewers looking for where the early learning
21 standards will align with the curriculum that's
22 currently used in programs?"

23 And I think again reviewers aren't going to
24 be digging into the early learning standards. They're
25 going to be looking at the documentation that you

1 provide. So if you want to show why these are solid
2 early learning standards, you're going to be providing
3 evidence of that. You're going to be providing
4 documentation, so that would really be up to you to
5 determine what you think is the best information to
6 share with them to show why your early learning
7 standards are meeting the criteria. Right?

8 And the linkage to program standards, I'm
9 being told on the side, what -- I'm not exactly sure
10 what she's thinking, and I hate to put words in
11 people's mouths --

12 DR. JONES: She's coming to the mic to make
13 herself clear. Jennifer is running to the mic.

14 MS. TSCHANTZ: Sorry. I just wanted to make
15 that final linkage back to the program standards so
16 that that's where you would talk about, you know, your
17 early learning standards are the basis and how programs
18 should be using them to guide -- to make instructional
19 decisions, to make decisions about the curricula and
20 those pieces, so you would talk to that in your program
21 standards piece.

22 DR. JONES: So we're going to have, as we've
23 said, more time at the end for more questions. If
24 you -- as you hear all these pieces put together you
25 start to get more questions, we'll try to answer them.

1 So Richard, you're on.

2 MR. GONZALES: Hello everybody. My name is
3 Richard Gonzales. I'm with the Administration for
4 Children and Families, and I'm going to talk to you
5 about Criterion (C)(3). Criterion (C)(3) is about
6 identifying and addressing the health, behavior and
7 developmental needs of children with high needs to
8 improve school readiness. If you choose to respond to
9 this selection criterion, you will address four areas
10 in your high-quality plan, the first three areas of
11 which you can see on this slide, slide 83.

12 Establishing a progression of health and
13 safety standards; ensuring screening and follow-up and
14 promoting healthy development across the program
15 standard levels; increasing the number of early
16 childhood educators trained and supported in meeting
17 health standards; promoting healthy eating habits,
18 nutrition and physical health; and on the next slide
19 which we'll go to in a moment, leveraging existing
20 resources to increase screenings or well-baby and child
21 services consistent with Child Find.

22 Now before we go on to that fourth element, I
23 want to make a couple of points of clarification. When
24 we talk about establishing a progression of health and
25 safety standards, (C)(3)(a), we're linking back to the

1 creation of the tiered program standards in (B)(1). So
2 if your state does not have strong standards for health
3 and safety, this criterion gives you the opportunity to
4 develop a detailed work plan to build out such tiered
5 standards.

6 Also, there's important information in the
7 definition of program standards that you'll find in the
8 definitions section. Under small (e) of the program
9 standards, you will find a description of the
10 expectations for health promotion standards. So you'll
11 want to pay attention to that piece in the definition.

12 Continuing selection Criterion (C)(3), note
13 that there is a performance measure for (C)(3)(d)
14 focused on leveraging existing resources in order to
15 increase the number of children with high needs in your
16 state who are screened, referred for services, receive
17 follow-up and participate in ongoing well-child care
18 visits. We'll look at the table associated with this
19 performance measure in a moment, but first, let's look
20 at the evidence requested for Criterion (C)(3).

21 Applicants that choose to address this
22 criterion are asked to submit their progression of
23 health standards, the extent to which they are already
24 developed, including documentation that the standards
25 appropriately address multiple areas related to healthy

1 children as outlined in the definition of program
2 standards and as you can see in the purple section on
3 this slide.

4 As evidence for (C)(3)(b), applicants are
5 asked to submit documentation on the numbers and
6 percentages of early childhood educators who receive
7 training and support in meeting the health standards.

8 And on the next slide, applicants are asked
9 to submit documentation of resources that are or will
10 be used to address the health, behavioral and
11 developmental needs of children with high needs
12 including, at a minimum, screening, referral and
13 follow-up, promoting participation in ongoing
14 healthcare, promoting healthy eating habits, improved
15 nutrition and increased physical activity and promoting
16 health literacy for children and parents.

17

18 KAREN: Hi. Karen from Minnesota.

19 So I just want to be clear, when you -- in
20 this section when you're talking about health,
21 behavioral and developmental needs, is this definition
22 of developmental needs exclusive of the domain of
23 school readiness as previously defined? In other
24 words, are you referring to physical health development
25 and the like or other kinds of development like

1 cognitive? You're referring to the whole ball of wax
2 or just --

3 MR. GONZALES: That's right, the whole ball
4 of wax.

5 KAREN: Okay.

6 MR. GONZALES: Okay. So on slide 87, we see
7 the table for performance measures for (C)(3)(d). As
8 with the other performance measures, applicants will
9 provide baseline data and set targets. Remember to
10 fill in all of the cells. In the bottom row of the
11 table, you should describe the methodology you're using
12 to collect the data or describe your methods for
13 estimating the data if you do not have actual baselines
14 at the time of the application.

15 Are there any other questions?

16 If not, I get to pass this to Steven.

17 MR. HICKS: Thanks, Richard.

18 Okay. Now on to Criterion (4), (C)(4). This
19 is one about family engagement and supporting families
20 so that children with high needs enter school ready to
21 succeed. And states that choose to address this
22 criteria are asked to describe their high-quality plan
23 for providing information and support to families of
24 children with high needs through three ways. By (a)
25 establishing a progression of standards for family

1 engagement that are culturally and linguistically
2 appropriate. Here again when we talk about
3 establishing a progression of standards for family
4 engagement, we are linking back to the creation of the
5 tiered program standards in (B)(1). If your state does
6 not have strong standards for family engagement, this
7 criterion gives you the opportunity to develop a
8 detailed work plan to build out such tiered standards.

9 Another way is through (b) increasing the
10 number of early childhood educators who are trained and
11 supported in implementing those family engagement
12 strategies. And then finally (c) promoting family
13 support and engagement across the state including by
14 leveraging other existing resources. And this is where
15 we had -- Joan had talked earlier about examples such
16 as outreach to family, friend and neighbor and home
17 visiting programs, leveraging those existing resources.
18 And note there is important information in the
19 definition of program standards under letter (d) which
20 describes the expectation for family engagement
21 standards. And that, you can just make a note, is on
22 page 19 of the application.

23 This is slide 89. States that choose to
24 address the criterion of (C)(4) are asked to submit
25 their progression of family engagement standards, the

1 extent to which they are already developed, including
2 documentation for this progression of standards
3 including the information outlined in the definition of
4 program standards that relate to family engagement, and
5 that's highlighted in this purple area, in the purple
6 text on the slide, and activities that enhance the
7 capacity of families to support their children's
8 education and development.

9 And on slide 90, states that are addressing
10 (C)(4) are also asked to submit documentation on the
11 number and percentage of early childhood educators who
12 receive training and support on the family engagement
13 strategies. If you do not have these data, then you
14 should provide a plan on how you will develop them.
15 And then also submit documentation of existing
16 resources that you are planning to use to promote
17 family support and engagement statewide.

18 So we have some time for some questions on
19 this area, family engagement, Criterion (C)(4), but
20 we'll also take some other questions that you've been
21 holding onto before we take our break which is going to
22 be in about 23 minutes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mine is I think in the
24 second category. We're wondering with these areas
25 where a focused investment where we have choices, is it

1 appropriate to describe our high-quality plan in a
2 focused investment area even if we are not seeking to
3 use the Early Learning Challenge funds to carry out
4 that plan, where we may have other investments like
5 philanthropy or that sort of thing and -- but it's part
6 of our big picture. We're just not asking for these
7 funds to do it?

8 MS. CARON: I think what you want to do is
9 make it perfectly clear to the reviewers exactly what
10 you're laying out. So if you have a piece that you
11 think is important, and you want them to know that that
12 exists and you're working on it, you would want to
13 include that in your plan, and then tell them about it,
14 and then explain that funds are not going to it. But
15 you also wouldn't want to like let it seem like a hole
16 that you had overlooked.

17 So I mean if you think it's important in your
18 plan, by all means include it.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there interest in
21 this criterion about more mass media parent engagement
22 strategies that would reach all parents, including
23 high-needs parents?

24 MR. GONZALES: Could you just repeat that
25 question?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. You know, in
2 Washington we have a real exciting thing called Love,
3 Talk, Play which is an outreach to all families. And
4 some of them are high-needs, some of them are not high-
5 needs. But it's a very engaging program, and we do a
6 lot of the more targeted things you're talking about
7 here. But I'm asking is there any interest in this
8 more massive kind of media outreach to all families?

9 MS. CARON: And I think I mean that's
10 specific to your state. That's something that you want
11 to put forward, by all means. But that's something
12 that you would have to make the determination in your
13 state whether that's what you want to put forward.
14 There's nothing in the criteria that would signal that
15 you couldn't do that or that you should do that or
16 anything. That's up to you and it's up to your --

17 MR. HICKS: Remember we said "but not limited
18 to," so these were just some examples.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great.

20 MR. HICKS: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

22 MS. CARON: Okay. Let's get a couple of
23 questions that were left from (B) from the regions that
24 we didn't get to.

25 This is from Region 7, and the question was

1 about the valid and reliable tool for monitoring in
2 (B)(3). This is Betty. She asked if the monitoring is
3 related to how the rating is established, or is it
4 post-rating monitoring?

5 And here states are to describe how their
6 rating and monitoring system is credible and reliable,
7 that it includes a valid and reliable tool to assess
8 the quality and assess the ratings, and the state
9 should include ways that the state's monitoring program
10 complies with the performance -- the program standards
11 over time. So this is a case where you make your best
12 case, and you lay it out for the reviewer in your --

13 And I'm trying to see if there's another
14 question on here as well. I think we got to the other
15 one. It's sometimes hard to know whether we've gotten
16 to the question in the talking points because we have a
17 lag between what we can get to from the states.

18 We had a question about the validation in
19 (B)(5), and this is about whether or not there needs to
20 be an external evaluator. Does it need to be somebody
21 that's outside of the lead agency? And the criterion
22 does not speak specifically to the particulars of the
23 evaluator other than that needs to be an independent
24 evaluator. So again, you put forth what your plan is,
25 and then the reviewers will look at that and see

1 whether or not they think it's an independent
2 evaluator.

3 Let's see. This is about program standards,
4 and this is from Region 10. So program standards in
5 Table (B)(1)-1 is not limited to TQRIS standards but is
6 a list of current and various program standards used in
7 the various programs. So they're looking for some more
8 specifics on this.

9 The Table (B)(1)-1 is not limited to just
10 TQRIS. The table is intended to capture the
11 information of all the program standards that are
12 currently used in your state. Again, you're describing
13 what your state looks like currently. In responding to
14 Criterion (B)(1) explain the linkages of those various
15 standards to the program standards for the TQRIS which
16 are captured in this table. So hopefully that's clear
17 enough now.

18 And we also got a question regarding Table
19 (B)(4)(c). This is from Kara in Oregon in regards to
20 the early learning and development programs that are
21 receiving funds from state CCDF funds. So this may be
22 one that we've touched on, but it may be one that's not
23 clear enough yet. Are these programs, the CCDF,
24 subsidized kids or are the programs that are -- are
25 they programs that are licensed as using CCDF funds to

1 support the licensing?

2 So in Table (B)(4)(c)(2), we're referring to
3 the programs that are receiving -- that are serving
4 children who receive a CCDF subsidy. However, the
5 overall competition certainly envisions aligning all
6 the early learning resources in a state including the
7 quality dollars from CCDF. So hopefully that clarifies
8 that a little bit.

9 Questions in the back?

10 MS. SUTTER: Hi. Jessica from D.C.

11 Question about the early learning standards.
12 There's a specific Criterion (C)(1)(b) that talks about
13 alignment of the early learning standards to the
14 state's K-3 standards. I imagine some other states may
15 also be in the boat that we are in which is that we
16 adopted the common core standards, and those are in the
17 process of rolling out this year. Is there a way or
18 has there been any thought given to a state portraying
19 its existing early learning standards aligned with its
20 old K-3 standards as a program already in place, an
21 implemented plan that says we used to have an
22 alignment, but now we've adopted new standards or are
23 in the process of doing it, so you've got both a high-
24 quality plan as well as an old, well-implemented plan?

25 MS. CARON: That seems perfectly reasonable

1 that you would lay out whatever -- right. If that's
2 what's happening in your state and you want to describe
3 that, it seems like perfectly reasonable that you would
4 put that all forth, and describe it in both ways, and
5 let people know exactly where you are, where you stand
6 in your state, yeah.

7 We have one, one point to --

8 DR. JONES: I just, you know, whatever the
9 situations are, please try to explain these in ways
10 that a reviewer can understand. I think that's really
11 important, that you have lots of curious things going
12 on, but the reviewers have to be able to figure out
13 what is happening in that state. And so be mindful of
14 that.

15 MS. CARON: Okay. Now we have a health
16 question.

17 MR. ASKEW: Hi. This is George Askew from
18 the Administrative for Children and Families.

19 And we have a question from Region 6, Paul in
20 Oklahoma I guess. And the question is "What is the
21 definition of health literacy, and how is it different
22 from health promotion?"

23 And I'll do the first part -- the second part
24 first. Health promotion is really broad support
25 directed towards specific health issues, and I think

1 you'll see that there are specific health issues that
2 we talk about when we mention health promotion within
3 the document. Health literacy is basically the ability
4 to obtain, process and understand basic health
5 information and services, and in this case, relative to
6 helping parents making decisions on meeting the health
7 needs of their children. So I think that's sort of the
8 most basic definition I could give that would get the
9 point across.

10 Paul, I hope that helps. If not, please send
11 us another message.

12 MS. CARON: Okay. Do we have other questions
13 in the room now?

14 One more in the front. Right here in the
15 front. I probably should have just walked over
16 there --

17 MS. BURKE BRYANT: Hi, just a quick follow-
18 up, Elizabeth Burke Bryant, Rhode Island, to the
19 question about Table (B)(4)(c)(2) where it has a list
20 of programs on the left-hand margin, and then you go
21 two more slides to 73 that talks about a tiered quality
22 rating and improvement system in which all licensed or
23 state regulated early learning and development programs
24 participate. Does that back map to that list of
25 programs in the left-hand margin? I assume it does,

1 but I thought I'd ask.

2 MS. CARON: So you're talking about that --
3 what's listed in priority -- in the competitive
4 preference priority mapping back to --

5 MS. BURKE BRYANT: Yeah. In other words, the
6 table as you very nicely described it in (B)(4)(c)(2)
7 asks you to provide sort of baseline information on
8 which of these programs are in the quality rating and
9 improvement system. And then when you go from slide 71
10 over to slide 73 in the competitive preference priority
11 it talks about a tiered quality rating and improvement
12 system in which all licensed or state regulated early
13 learning and development programs participate. I
14 assume that means such as the programs that are
15 outlined in (B)(4)(c)(2)?

16 MS. RUDISILL: Hi, Elizabeth. Shannon. I
17 was ready to toss my notes away and then -- okay.
18 So -- but I think it's not exactly the same.

19 MS. BURKE BRYANT: Okay.

20 MS. RUDISILL: Because of the question that
21 Kara from Oregon also had been asking because we don't
22 ask you in (B)(2)(c) to -- (B)(4), sorry. Anyway,
23 to -- we don't ask you for licensed specifically,
24 right? So you -- there's a place you could add a row
25 for licensed. And her question was when you talk about

1 CCDF do you mean licensed there? And the answer was
2 well, we mean people who are receiving a CCDF subsidy
3 there. So I think it's not exactly the same. Here
4 we're trying to get to as many licensed programs as
5 possible in your QRIS. If you wanted to add that row
6 to your table it might help you but -- make your case,
7 but you don't have to.

8 MS. BURKE BRYANT: Okay. Thanks.

9 MS. CARON: Okay. Other questions?

10 One more in the front row in the green.

11 MS. HAWLEY: Hi. Theresa Hawley, Illinois.

12 Under (B)(2), just going back to like what is
13 okay to not include in the TQRIS is it -- are we
14 correct to assume that it's appropriate to not cover
15 with that individual therapies that are provided in a
16 therapist's office under Part C?

17 MS. CARON: You're saying would you not
18 include those in a TQRIS?

19 MS. HAWLEY: Right. Right. They're not in
20 the kid's home, but they're in a therapist's office,
21 but they're one-on-one speech therapy, developmental
22 therapy, whatever.

23 MS. CARON: Yeah. And that's for you, that's
24 for you to decide based on what's laid out in the
25 criterion, but it sounds like similar to the home base

1 that's not a system that lends itself to a TQRIS. So
2 you would make the determination, but it doesn't say
3 specifically one way or the other. So reviewers won't
4 look for that piece of information, so you just again
5 make your case.

6 MS. HAWLEY: Okay.

7 MS. CARON: Okay. I think since we're a
8 little ahead of time we'll have our break a few minutes
9 early. So we'll break for 15 minutes, and then we'll
10 come back at 4:30 and wrap things up.

11 (Off the record at 4:15 p.m.)

12 (On the record at 4:30 p.m.)

13 MS. SANCHEZ FUENTES: Hi everyone. We're
14 going to get started in about 30 seconds.

15 So hi everyone. I am Yvette Sanchez Fuentes.
16 I'm the director for the Office of Head Start in the
17 Administration for Children and Families, and I feel
18 very grateful that I get to go after the break so
19 everybody has stretched a little bit, had some
20 chocolate, right, refilled their coffee, and
21 everybody's paying attention.

22 So we are now going to turn to Section (D)
23 which is about developing and supporting the state's
24 early childhood education workforce. States may choose
25 to work on one or both of these criteria depending on

1 where you feel in-depth focus can have the highest
2 impact in your state.

3 So before we jump into the criteria under
4 Section (D), we're going to walk through the definition
5 of an early childhood educator, since this defines the
6 early childhood education workforce that Section (D)
7 focuses on. So you'll see this in the highlighted
8 purple. The term broadly defines early childhood
9 educator to include the diversity of providers and
10 professionals that work with young children. Reviewers
11 will evaluate based on the extent to which the system
12 is inclusive of all of the providers and educators in
13 the field.

14 So just to add a little, one question that's
15 come up repeatedly is a question with regards to
16 credentials and degrees and whether there is an
17 assumption that it's a CDA, an AA, a BA, etc. This
18 again is really up to the states to determine where
19 they're going to take the workforce within as they're
20 painting the picture for their application.

21 So states that choose to write to Criterion
22 (D)(1) will be focusing on developing a common
23 statewide workforce knowledge and competency framework
24 geared toward improving child outcomes and a common
25 statewide progression of workforce credentials and

1 degrees linked to that framework. Additionally, states
2 are asked to develop a high-quality plan, to engage
3 post-secondary institutions and professional
4 development providers to align professional development
5 available in the state with the framework that you're
6 developing.

7 So moving on here, we have another
8 highlighted purple piece here. So clearly the
9 definition of workforce knowledge and competency
10 framework is an important one to this criterion. So
11 keep that in mind. The workforce knowledge and
12 competency framework means a set of expectations that
13 describes what early childhood educators should know
14 and be able to do. The definition provides minimum
15 characteristics, so again just some minimum information
16 for your use, of a workforce knowledge and competency
17 framework. The framework should be evidence based;
18 incorporate knowledge and application of the state's
19 early learning and development standards, comprehensive
20 assessment systems, child development, health and be
21 culturally and linguistically -- and include culturally
22 and linguistically appropriate strategies for engaging
23 families; support math and literacy development in
24 young children; incorporate effective use of data for
25 instructional and program improvement purposes; include

1 effective behavior management strategies that promote
2 positive social emotional development; and include a
3 mechanism for incorporating feedback from early
4 learning and development experts.

5 So please keep in mind that this criterion
6 also requires states to submit evidence. The evidence
7 should be described in the narrative by discussing how
8 each piece of evidence demonstrates the state's success
9 in meeting the criterion. The state may also include
10 any additional information it believes will be helpful
11 to peer reviewers.

12 So moving on to Criterion (D)(2), supporting
13 early childhood educators and improving their
14 knowledge, skills and abilities. Applicants here should
15 describe, so you should describe your plans for
16 improving the effectiveness of the early childhood
17 workforce and especially for retaining that workforce.
18 There are four sub-criteria under (D)(2) that outline
19 the ways in which applicants should be supporting early
20 childhood educators. Access to effective professional
21 development, policies and incentives that promote
22 career advancement. You should also -- hold on a
23 second. That promote career advancement, report --
24 that you can report publicly, such as on a website, on
25 the development, advancement and retention of the

1 workforce. Hope that piece made sense.

2 In addition, there are performance measures
3 for this criterion.

4 Everybody okay? Questions?

5 Can you repeat that? Where did you go? Yes.
6 Okay.

7 So in Criterion (D)(2) there are four sub-
8 criteria that outline the ways in which applicants
9 should be supporting early childhood educators. So
10 some of these pieces are access to effective
11 professional development. You can also include
12 policies and incentives that promote career
13 advancement. And you should be reporting these
14 publicly. So one example is on a website.

15 Does that make sense? That makes more sense?

16 Okay. One of the performance measures for
17 this criterion asks you to set ambitious yet achievable
18 targets for improving the number of providers, whether
19 post-secondary or other organizations, whose programs
20 are aligned with the state's workforce knowledge and
21 competency framework and to set targets for the number
22 of ECEs who get credentialed by these aligned
23 providers.

24 The other performance measure asks you to set
25 targets for ECEs to progress to higher levels of

1 credentials. So that's to say to improve skills and
2 trainings of the workforce.

3 So here's an example of a performance
4 measure, of the performance measure table for Criterion
5 (D)(2). There we go. Sorry about that. So here's the
6 table. In this table and in the performance measure
7 table for (D)(2)(d)(2) you'll fill in your baseline
8 data in the first column and then your annual targets
9 in the next four columns. Please remember that all
10 cells that are blank should be filled in.

11 And we will open it up to questions or
12 comments.

13 Okay. That was easy. Everybody got it,
14 right?

15 MS. CALDERON: Hello. So we very
16 strategically placed the data conversation late in the
17 day. So we're going to talk now about Criterion (E),
18 measuring outcomes and progress. For those of you that
19 want to follow along in your applications, you can turn
20 to page 68.

21 There are two criteria for (E). Here a state
22 may choose to work on one or both of the criteria. The
23 first criterion is about putting a kindergarten entry
24 assessment in place, and if the state writes to this,
25 as you'll remember, it can earn competitive points, and

1 we're going to talk a little more about this in a
2 moment.

3 The second criterion is about having a strong
4 statewide data system in place. Just a quick note
5 about scoring in this section. Section (E) is worth up
6 to 40 points. If you write to one criterion you can
7 earn up to 40 points, and if you write to both (E)(1)
8 and (E)(2) each is worth up to 20 points. Remember
9 that you provide the rationale for which criterion
10 you're going to choose to address in your application
11 back in (A)(2).

12 So diving into (E)(1), this is about
13 developing a high-quality plan to implement a statewide
14 kindergarten entry assessment that can be used to
15 understand the status of children's learning and
16 development at kindergarten entry. We're going to
17 start by looking at the defined term in the application
18 for kindergarten entry assessment. In case there are
19 questions about that we'll go back to the defined term
20 which tells us about the administration of the
21 assessment, the properties of the assessment and
22 provides important information on the purposes of
23 kindergarten entry assessments.

24 As you see, the definition clarifies that
25 assessments should happen during the first few months

1 of kindergarten, cover all essential domains of school
2 readiness, which is also a defined term, and be aligned
3 to your state's early learning standards. The
4 assessment must be valid and reliable for the target
5 population and the purposes for which it was designed.
6 The purpose of the kindergarten entry assessment should
7 be to inform instruction and your efforts to close
8 school readiness gaps. It should not be used in a
9 manner that prevents children's entry into
10 kindergarten.

11 A few more things to note about Criterion
12 (E)(1). Again, the issue of working independently or
13 working as part of a cross-state consortia comes up
14 here. Remember there is no explicit preference given
15 to working independently versus part of a consortium,
16 so take whatever approach you feel is the highest
17 quality for your kindergarteners and most effective
18 from a resource standpoint.

19 If you are proposing a phased-in
20 implementation, you want to be thoughtful about which
21 children or parts of your state or districts will be
22 implemented by 2014 and 2015 and provide information
23 about why you're making those decisions. These would
24 be described in your high-quality plan where you
25 articulate your goals, your activities and your

1 timeline including for who is assessed and when they
2 will be assessed in order to reach the goal of
3 statewide implementation.

4 We've also had some questions on whether or
5 not you can use a sampling procedure - this is not
6 prohibited. However, you should be sure to tie your
7 assessment approach back to how you plan to use this
8 data.

9 Finally, it is important to note that states
10 are evaluated on the extent to which their kindergarten
11 entry assessment will be funded in significant part
12 with resources other than those from this grant. We've
13 talked a lot about sustainability, and you've heard
14 much about that today. We want to be sure that
15 kindergarten entry assessments are not funded by this
16 grant, administered once or twice and then abolished.
17 Instead, it would be our hope that states that choose
18 to write to this criterion believe in the value of
19 gathering this data, making it available to researchers
20 over time and using it to improve the quality of
21 instruction for young children. As such, it would be
22 important to have a way to sustain it and to talk about
23 that in your application.

24 We received a question from Kristen in Oregon
25 earlier this morning related to kindergarten entry

1 assessments, so I want to go ahead and address that
2 question now. Kristen's question is, "We are revamping
3 K entry assessments. How do we reflect that on page 38
4 which is a table under Criterion (A)?"

5 Kristen, you should provide information on
6 your K entry assessment in that table under Criterion
7 (A) regardless of deciding to address (E)(1) or not.
8 If you write to (E)(1) you would also describe your
9 high-quality plan for meeting all of the elements of
10 this criterion. If that doesn't answer your question,
11 Kristen, please let us know.

12 So now we're going to turn to everyone's
13 favorite, extra credit and the competitive preference
14 priority number 3. This is tied to Criterion (E)(1).
15 I want to point out that applicants do not write to
16 this competitive preference priority in a separate
17 response. You will note that there is no text box
18 provided for any narrative. Rather, this competitive
19 priority, ten points can be earned in one of two ways,
20 and you just simply check a box and tell the reviewers
21 which of the two ways or two approaches you are taking.

22 First, you can provide data in Table (A)(1)-
23 12. That can be found on page 38 of your application.
24 And what you will do in that table is show that you
25 already have a kindergarten entry assessment in place

1 that meets all of the elements in selection Criterion
2 (E)(1).

3 Questions?

4 The second way to address this criterion is
5 write to it in (E)(1) to address -- I'm sorry. The
6 second way to address this competitive preference
7 priority and earn the ten extra-credit points is to
8 write to Criterion (E)(1). And you must earn a score
9 of at least 70 percent of the points available.
10 Remember the maximum number of available points for
11 (E)(1) is either 20 or 40 depending on whether you're
12 writing to (E)(1) and (E)(2) or just (E)(1).

13 So to receive the competitive preference
14 points you'll need to receive an average across the
15 peer reviews of 28 of the 40 points if you addressed
16 only (E)(1), or you'll need to receive 14 of the
17 20 points if you addressed both (E)(1) and (E)(2). The
18 ten points for the competitive priority is earned on an
19 all-or-nothing basis. So the majority of the reviewers
20 will determine that the state has met the competitive
21 preference priority, and if they do that you'll get all
22 ten points, and if they don't you get zero. Sorry to
23 put it that bluntly.

24 Are there any questions about (E)(1) or the
25 competitive preference priority before I turn it over?

1 MR. FURR: Hi. This is Jon Furr from the
2 state of Illinois.

3 Question about the expectation for a
4 statewide assessment. Does that imply that you -- when
5 it's statewide that the assessment is used for all
6 children that are entering public kindergarten, or is
7 that a different -- do you mean to have a different
8 reason for saying it's statewide other than the
9 requirement that all children have to be assessed?

10 MS. CALDERON: So consistent with many of the
11 reforms that we've talked about today you would
12 describe in your high-quality plan how you would scale
13 and basically take the kindergarten entry assessment
14 statewide. You would make decisions about all children
15 or some children but we're -- so those are decisions
16 that you make and use your judgment, but we are talking
17 about describing how you plan to take it statewide.

18 Does that answer your question?

19 MR. FURR: Yeah. I'm just struggling
20 whether -- because I know that there was the word "all"
21 I think in the draft criteria which was taken out. But
22 I think we're still trying to figure out whether the
23 word a statewide assessment is still --

24 MS. CALDERON: Statewide means all
25 children --

1 MR. FURR: -- is still meant to imply all
2 children.

3 MS. CALDERON: Right. Well, as I spoke to,
4 you could be making a decision to use a sampling
5 procedure. And you could describe how that would be
6 statewide, how you would take that statewide which
7 would not necessarily mean all children.

8 Is that -- does that help?

9 MR. FURR: Yeah. I guess we're also
10 wondering if there would be other statewide strategies
11 that might tie it to funding streams that might not
12 necessarily be used by all -- by every public school
13 within the state, but it would still be a statewide
14 program because of the relationship with that
15 connection. And this is, you know, generally getting
16 the challenge of, you know, for many states we need
17 legislation in place for a statewide assessment program
18 which is given where we are in the -- our legislative
19 cycle is not feasible by the time this application is
20 submitted.

21 MS. CALDERON: Okay. Why don't you just
22 write -- why don't you write that down on the note card
23 that's provided. I'll come and grab it, and we'll talk
24 amongst ourselves and make sure we can get you a more
25 clear answer. Okay.

1 MS. RAMSEY: Bridget Ramsey, Kentucky.

2 Can you hear me?

3 MS. CALDERON: Yes, I can.

4 MS. RAMSEY: Okay. Bridget Ramsey, Kentucky.

5 And with respect to the kindergarten entry assessment,
6 do states have flexibility in the number of assessments
7 that they choose to make available to their school
8 districts?

9 MS. CALDERON: So as part of your assessment
10 of children's development and learning upon entering
11 the kindergarten, is your question does it need to be
12 one assessment or --

13 MS. RAMSEY: That is my question.

14 MS. CALDERON: -- can it be multiple
15 assessments?

16 I will look back to the defined term, which
17 is always a good strategy to start. I hope you're
18 always looking back to your defined terms here.

19 MS. RAMSEY: Excellent modeling.

20 (Laughter)

21 MS. CALDERON: Joanne.

22 MS. WEISS: Yeah. And certainly because
23 we're -- because it's asking for assessments across all
24 these essential domains of school readiness, I think
25 the expectation is probably that it is multiple

1 assessments.

2 MS. CALDERON: That's --

3 MS. RAMSEY: That a state would allow for
4 choice.

5 DR. JONES: Well, let's be clear about
6 multiple assessments. We're saying multiple domains.

7 MS. RAMSEY: And that piece I understand,
8 that the assessment would be multi-domained. But would
9 a state be required to identify one --

10 MS. CALDERON: The assessment should be --

11 MS. RAMSEY: -- but would a state be required
12 to identify one assessment that meets the criteria, or
13 would we have the freedom to identify a basket, so to
14 speak, of assessments that meet the criteria that are
15 available then to our districts and schools to use?

16 DR. JONES: I think we've been sort of silent
17 on that. We've said that there are domains that have
18 to be addressed, both cognitive and non-cognitive
19 domains and I think that you have to propose the best
20 way that you think that needs to be done.

21 [Note: This is clarified on p. 239, lines 4-5, to say
22 that the criterion asks for the extent to which the
23 State is using a common, statewide assessment].

24 MS. RAMSEY: Okay. That answers the question.

25 MS. CALDERON: Okay.

1 MS. RAMSEY: Thank you.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Miriam?

3 MS. CALDERON: Yes. Question from Dan.

4 MR. HAGGARD: Hi, Miriam.

5 MS. CALDERON: Hi.

6 MR. HAGGARD: May I ask that in a different
7 way? I understand that there might need to be multiple
8 assessments in order to cover all the domains. But
9 would all of the schools in the state need to use the
10 same battery of assessments in order that the data be
11 common at the state level, or are you talking about
12 districts being able to choose for themselves how they
13 do this? In -- and in that way, there would no be a
14 common battery of assessments.

15 MS. CALDERON: So Dan, my response to that
16 would be that the definition, as Jacqueline just
17 stated, doesn't specify that. And what you would need
18 to do in your application --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Give Jacqueline a
20 chance --

21 MS. CALDERON: Okay. Never mind.
22 Jacqueline.

23 DR. JONES: We've stated that it should be a
24 common, statewide kindergarten entry assessment.

25 MR. HAGGARD: That answers it.

1 DR. JONES: Okay. A common one. So while
2 there are multiple domains that have to be addressed,
3 it should be a common measure across the state.

4 MS. CALDERON: Okay. Thank you, Jacqueline.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So that -- yeah, so
6 that's a different answer --

7 DR. JONES: Did I not answer yours? So it's
8 a different answer --

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, you just revised
10 the answer --

11 DR. JONES: Okay. I just revised your
12 answer. Is that what I did? They're telling me I lied
13 to you.

14 MS. RAMSEY: I think she said a common
15 assessment, one common assessment for the entire state.
16 So that implies to me that we would be required to
17 choose one multi-domained assessment that our entire
18 state is using. The alternative for us would be to
19 offer, for a variety of reasons, to offer multiple
20 assessments that are multi-domained but are correlated
21 so that we get a common measure. And I'm looking for
22 guidance.

23 DR. JONES: Okay. So let's separate the
24 multiple domains, because that's clear that we want
25 multiple domains, from the common assessment. So

1 you're proposing or you're saying is it possible to
2 propose several assessments that have multiple domains
3 and then try to tie them together --

4 MS. RAMSEY: Yes.

5 DR. JONES: -- in some way so that you can
6 collect it --

7 MS. RAMSEY: So that we have a common
8 measure.

9 DR. JONES: That's something that if you wish
10 to propose that, but we've said a common, statewide
11 kindergarten entry assessment. So if that is your
12 proposal, then the reviewers would have to see how that
13 connects to a common measure. -

14

15 Let me read the criterion for you and --

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's the very stem.
17 It's the very stem of the criteria.

18 DR. JONES: Okay.

19 MS. CALDERON: We can't see the stem.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go back --

21 DR. JONES: Okay. Let's look at this.

22 MS. CALDERON: It's the defined term

23 DR. JONES: Okay. So the extent to which the
24 state has a high-quality plan to implement
25 independently or as part of a cross-state consortium a

1 common, statewide kindergarten entry assessment that
2 informs instruction and services in the early
3 elementary grades
4 -- so that's what reviewers will be looking for. So
5 you can propose a multitude of things, but it is the
6 task of the reviewers to read that stem and look for
7 that.

8 Does that help? I can't tell you what to do,
9 but I can tell you what the reviewers will be looking
10 for.

11 MS. CALDERON: Yes.

12 MS. MAXWELL: Kelly Maxwell from North
13 Carolina.

14 I have a question about -- you said that the
15 kindergarten entry assessment was for two purposes.
16 One, to inform instruction, and the second is to help
17 close the achievement gap. So I want to hearken back
18 again to the days of the National Education Goals
19 Panel, and there was a report, a really nice report,
20 that talked about principles and recommendations for
21 assessing young children. They talked about four
22 purposes. So I'm trying to ask for a little
23 information about where you see closing the achievement
24 gap. So those four purposes were screening children,
25 helping guide instruction, program evaluation and

1 accountability. So where do you see the closing the
2 achievement gap?

3 DR. JONES: So if you think about the Goals
4 Panel and those four goals, and if we assume that those
5 are the only ones -- I mean that's not clear that I'm
6 assuming they're the only ones. But if I think about
7 informing what we know and how we build on where we
8 are, I see this as a measure, and we see this as a
9 measure, to give us some indication of where children
10 are at kindergarten entry. It's a one point in time
11 piece of data. Where are they? And how do we use
12 those data to inform instruction so we know what kinds
13 of programs we can start to build for children, and we
14 can know how we can then sort of help to make that
15 better, make their scores better.

16 What we want is to see that baseline bit of
17 information, if you haven't done this already, and then
18 to build in that so that children are doing better as
19 they're entering kindergarten. So it's hard to put
20 this right nicely into the cake and -- and worst model,
21 but I think it is both informing what we know and
22 trying to build on it. It is not an accountability
23 measure. So let's be very clear here. That's not the
24 intent. The intent is to look at where children are
25 when they enter kindergarten. So I can't put it in

1 there as nicely as you'd like me to because I don't
2 think it fits that well.

3 MS. CALDERON: Right. And I would just add
4 that it is an assessment that is part of potentially
5 other assessments that are happening in your state.
6 We've heard -- you've heard today about comprehensive
7 assessment systems. You've heard about -- we're going
8 to --
9 -- you're going to hear in a moment about statewide
10 longitudinal data systems and opportunities you have to
11 build assessment systems in your state. So this is a
12 component.

13 KAREN: Hi. Karen from Minnesota. Thanks
14 for tolerating our questions around this important
15 issue.

16 MS. CALDERON: Oh, it's great.

17 KAREN: So just to be clear, so I heard you
18 say that it possibly could be a sample, not necessarily
19 a universal thing, and so if that is the case then the
20 spirit of informing instruction is really about
21 informing statewide instructional practices, not
22 classroom based instruction, since it wouldn't be in
23 every --

24 DR. JONES: So when you decide the
25 methodological approach, you need to be able to tell us

1 why you've done that and how you intend to use those
2 data. So use of data, methodological approach that
3 would give you what you want.

4 KAREN: Okay. Great. Thanks.

5 MS. CALDERON: So I'm going to turn it over
6 now --

7 DR. JONES: I have one more question.

8 MS. CALDERON: Okay. Oh, okay.

9 DR. JONES: So go ahead, read yours.

10 MS. CARON: I think these are both pretty
11 straightforward ones. Hopefully. Connie from Region 4,
12 "Is there a place to provide an explanation of the
13 information around your kindergarten entry assessment
14 in Table (A)(1)-12?"

15 And I think that's literally one of those
16 examples where if there's not a line in there for you
17 to put a footnote, just put a footnote in and make a
18 mark in the table, add the information below. If
19 there's not a space for you to do what you need to do,
20 then add a space. So, straightforward.

21 DR. JONES: Okay. And this is from Sherene
22 (phonetic) in -- and I don't know what region this is.
23 Question from Boston it says. "Regarding (E)(1)
24 kindergarten entry assessment that includes all the
25 elements of (A)(1)-12, indicates a formative assessment

1 tool, one that accounts for multiple domains. Is this
2 the intention?"

3 We have not defined the type of kindergarten
4 entry measure that it should be. So it's up to you to
5 make that determination. We have not said it's
6 formative. We have not said it's norm-referenced. -
7 it's up to you to decide what you want, your best
8 argument about what is the best approach to take.

9 MS. CARON: And I just have another quick one
10 from Paul in Oklahoma. "Regarding (E)(1)(e), are there
11 any guidelines or limitations as to what, if anything
12 can be funded from this grant for readiness
13 assessment?"

14 And we're not -- there's nothing in the
15 criteria that specifies. There are guidelines to use
16 other funds where available and appropriate but we're
17 not actually -- we have no magic number in mind of what
18 you should or should not, you know, use. But there is
19 language to try to fund this from other sources --

20 MS. CALDERON: Great. And with that, I'm
21 going to turn it over to my colleague Jennifer Tschantz
22 who's going to talk about criterion (E)(2). Thanks.

23 DR. JONES: So while they're in transition,
24 we do have one more -- I don't know from whom it is,
25 but it's from Illinois. "Can a common statewide

1 assessment be administered as part of a statewide
2 funding program in which not all school districts
3 participate? Must it be administered to all children
4 entering public kindergarten by 2014 to 2015?"

5 So this is the ambitious achievable piece.
6 You have to decide what you can do. What does your
7 plan say that it is possible to do? And then the
8 reviewers will look at that and make a determination.
9 But this is up to you, saying all right, we want to do
10 this. How are we going to do it? Proposing it to the
11 reviewers for their consideration.

12 MS. TSCHANTZ: Great. And now on to the very
13 last criterion. (E)(2). Yay, we made it through. And
14 we have lots more slides, so don't get too excited.
15 Not lots but several more slides to walk you through.
16 But this is actually the last criterion.

17 So Criterion (E)(2), if you choose to write
18 to this one, you'll describe your plans for enhancing
19 your statewide longitudinal data system or build or
20 enhance a coordinated early learning data system that
21 aligns to and is linked to the state SLDS or state
22 longitudinal data system. And it meets the criterion
23 kind of outlined here that:

24 (a) It incorporates all of the essential data
25 elements. And I'll share a slide on what we mean

1 there.

2 It enables uniform data collection across
3 participating state agencies as well as participating
4 programs.

5 It facilitates the exchange of data among
6 these participating state agencies.

7 Generates data that is timely, relevant,
8 accessible and usable for early learning and
9 development programs and specifically early childhood
10 educators. This is that link back to making data-based
11 decisions.

12 And finally, that it meets the data system
13 oversight requirements which means -- and complies with
14 the federal, state and local privacy laws.

15 So the statewide longitudinal data system, -
16 As many of you know, several years ago the Department
17 of Education put forward the 12 required elements of an
18 SLDS. Every state now has an SLDS running. Typically
19 it's housed within the state education agency, and for
20 this criterion states are encouraged to either expand
21 their SLDS down to the early learning space, as some of
22 the data people have said, the early learning space.
23 Still trying to figure out what that is. And -- or to
24 extend and connect a coordinated early learning data
25 system to your SLDS that incorporates the programs that

1 we're talking about today.

2 A little bit more on the essential data
3 elements. We're really trying to push the field of
4 data collection a step forward in -- by defining
5 elements necessary to broadly support early learning
6 data. We urge you to really take a close look at this
7 definition of essential data elements. I'm not going
8 to run through every single one. But it's really an
9 opportunity to get a head start on building a strong
10 data system for your state's earliest and youngest
11 learners.

12 Again remember, I'll just highlight this
13 again, that in program requirement (f) you must always
14 comply with applicable federal, state, local privacy
15 laws. This includes FERPA, HIPAA, IDEA, and I'm sure
16 there are many others out there that I don't even know
17 about.

18 One question that we've already gotten is
19 about the child and family demographic information
20 which is essential data element (d), and states are
21 asking, you know, what do we mean there. And this is
22 really a state's decision, and it will depend on how
23 you plan to use these data. So you know, think about
24 the questions that you want your data system to answer,
25 and that should help drive what the specific -- what

1 should be part of those specific elements because if
2 you get down the road, and you're not able to answer
3 the questions you want because you didn't, you know,
4 think through kind of what those different elements
5 should be.

6 So that's it on data systems. I know the --
7 Miriam's comment about data being the last at the end
8 of the day, it's kind of deadly, but you guys look
9 pretty awake so --

10 Any specific questions on the data?

11 DR. JONES: There's one in the back. Can we
12 get a mic?

13 TRACEY: Hi, this Tracey from West Virginia.
14 And I'm hoping Yvette is still here? It's kind of
15 specific to her.

16 MS. TSCHANTZ: She is. Yvette?

17 TRACEY: Great. She's getting a shout out
18 here.

19 I was wondering if she could answer the
20 question of the program instruction that she referred
21 to earlier to Head Start and Early Head Start grantees
22 within the state, was it intended to encourage them to
23 participate in state systems that are being developed
24 as a part of their state's Race to the Top application?

25 MS. SANCHEZ FUENTES: So if you take a look

1 at the PI it's very specific with regards to Race to
2 the Top. And so what we would encourage is for states
3 to bring Head Start and Early Head Start to the table
4 to talk about other possibilities of working together
5 or whether or not Head Start programs participate in
6 other state systems.

7 MR. HAGGARD: Dan Haggard from New Mexico,
8 and this again is for Yvette. Sorry, Yvette.

9 MS. TSCHANTZ: She just sat down. Come back
10 to the table.

11 MR. HAGGARD: Is it the expectation at the
12 federal level that Head Starts participate in a unique
13 identifier system?

14 MS. SANCHEZ FUENTES: Is it the expectation?

15 MR. HAGGARD: From the federal level?

16 MS. SANCHEZ FUENTES: At this point, we have
17 not issued any guidance or policy decisions with
18 regards to unique identifiers. But again, we always
19 encourage programs to talk to their state partners to
20 figure out what it is that works best for the kids in
21 those programs.

22 MR. HAGGARD: So it's up to the individual
23 grantee?

24 MS. SANCHEZ FUENTES: Um-hum.

25 MS. TSCHANTZ: More questions in the back?

1 MS. SUTTER: Hi. This is Jessica from D.C.
2 It goes back to Table (B)(1) -- I'm sorry, no, the
3 (B)(1) criterion when you asked about effective data
4 practices in the program standards, and I hoped we
5 might talk about it here. Can you -- that's not a
6 defined term. Can you talk a little bit more about
7 effective data practices in the TQRIS program standards
8 and how it might relate to the data systems?

9 MS. TSCHANTZ: Sure. So the idea in the
10 program standards is that programs that -- the program
11 standards should kind of talk about how programs should
12 be using data in an effective way. And there it's
13 broader. It's -- we want programs to be using
14 information from a data system such as the SLDS or the
15 coordinated early learning and development system. So
16 that's just one piece of the data we were talking
17 about. But also in the program standards it's all the
18 data, you know. We live in this time, in this world
19 where there's so much data available and really
20 encouraging and wanting programs to be able to use
21 information and data in a way that helps them. And
22 that's really kind of the essence of it.

23 Does that help?

24 MS. SUTTER: Yes.

25 MS. TSCHANTZ: Great.

1 Oh, okay. Go ahead. Sorry, I can't see.

2 MS. JONAS: Hi. Deborah from Virginia.

3 We have been talking within the context of
4 our longitudinal data system quite a bit, as many
5 states have, about Head Start data, and I'm with the
6 Department of Ed, not our DSS that coordinates -- is
7 the state coordinating body for Head Start. But we've
8 been told over the years that Head Start programs are
9 required to provide student data to their local public
10 schools by Head Start regulation. Now I don't know if
11 that's true, but I wonder if anyone here can clarify
12 that information as to whether that's accurate and if
13 so provide some more information so we can be clear on
14 that.

15 MS. SANCHEZ FUENTES: So just to be very
16 clear
17 it's not a requirement that the Office of Head Start
18 has issued to local Head Start and Early Head Start
19 programs. But what I do sort of want to make very
20 clear is that we constantly encourage our programs to
21 work with their state and their local partners. And
22 the law does require Head Start programs to sign MOUs
23 with their local education agencies, not just with
24 regards to disability services for children but also in
25 other ways that they can collaborate in order to make

1 sure that kids and families are receiving what they
2 need as they move into the public school system.

3 So it's not a requirement, but again, as much
4 as states and local programs can come to the table to
5 talk about what are the needs and what's important to
6 share, we believe very strongly that those kids are
7 part of those local communities, and they're part of
8 the state.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you -- have you
10 provided states or programs with guidance on that?
11 Because what we're hearing from the local Head Starts
12 is, you know, it's not that they don't want to do -- to
13 be helpful, it's just they need to know that they're --
14 they have the authority to do these kinds of things.
15 And they're not going to take action without direct
16 guidance.

17 MS. SANCHEZ FUENTES: So I think again what
18 we constantly say to programs is that we encourage
19 programs to do this as it best fits their needs and
20 especially the needs of their kids and their families.
21 But we have not issued formal policy requirements
22 around sharing data.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Question?

24 MS. GRACE: Yvette, hi. This is Cathy from
25 Mississippi, and I'm sorry I'm going to have to push a

1 little harder because --

2 MS. SANCHEZ FUENTES: That's okay.

3 MS. GRACE: -- when trying to set the data
4 systems up and to follow through with what you just
5 said about as inclusive as possible, Head Start is very
6 reluctant to do anything unless it is more than just an
7 encouragement. And it has been this way since the day
8 that conversation started over a year ago. And so is
9 there any way we can have any better understanding of
10 what the applications -- I'm not saying what the
11 reviewers will have as a way of understanding the
12 limitations that may come up in this particular
13 section.

14 DR. LOMBARDI: Well, you know, I want to
15 again iterate the importance that we see in having the
16 programs be coordinated with what you're doing. We
17 underscored that in the program instruction that Yvette
18 put out. You know, we can only require what we're
19 allowed to require, and we're really trying very hard
20 to align these data systems, our standards. We're
21 thinking a lot about it. We're talking a lot to the
22 programs. We think
23 -- this effort is an important step towards that. But
24 we're going to have to do it within the confines of
25 what we're allowed to do in administering the program.

1 So you know, we're really hopeful that the
2 conversations are going on across the states with the
3 Head Start community. And ---
4 -- but you know, there are limits to what we can
5 mandate.

6 MS. GRACE: I know she took the microphone
7 but I'll be brief. So my question, more around the
8 reviewers --

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait, wait, wait.

10 MS. GRACE: Okay. I'm sorry. The question
11 really was around would the reviewers have information
12 that helps them to understand when they review the
13 applications exactly what the limitations are. So I
14 understand that you all are doing all you can, but this
15 in terms of how they read these applications.

16 MS. CARON: The reviewers will only have what
17 the states provide on something like that. They're not
18 going to get any extra outside, 'these are the rule or
19 guidelines that this program must abide by, and these
20 are the requirements, and these are the permissions,
21 and these are the guidance that they've received'. So
22 it really is whatever the state can lay out for them.
23 If there's some extenuating circumstance that you think
24 is important in your state, just spell it out clearly.
25 Let the reviewers know that. Let them know what you're

1 up against, what you're dealing with, where you've made
2 progress. But they're not going to get any outside
3 information so --

4 ANITA: This is Anita from Mississippi, and
5 this is not a question. This is a comment.

6 For those folk who are having some challenges
7 with Head Start, because that's what I do every day,
8 first of all, you need to make sure that the person
9 that you're asking for the data has the authority to do
10 it. If you're talking to a local center, a center
11 can't make that decision. You have to go to -- through
12 the administrative offices of that Head Start grantee.

13 And I'm going to give you an example. Like
14 in Mississippi we have one grantee that serves 7,000
15 children over 25 counties with 54 different school
16 districts. You can't go to a local site and ask a
17 center manager can I get this data on this program. It
18 has to go to the entity that receives the grant. So
19 first of all, make sure you're asking the right person
20 to be able to authorize the release and use of that
21 data.

22 Also, every state has a state Head Start
23 collaboration office, and most of them have
24 associations. Maybe that's the entity that you need to
25 go through to help you have those conversations with

1 those individual grantees that will help you get that
2 data. I really don't want to -- and I don't know if
3 that's the tone, I just want to make sure -- I really
4 don't want people to think that Head Start does not
5 want to be cooperative. But we have a responsibility
6 to our children and families as well. And while, you
7 know, if we have these wonderful, trusting
8 relationships, but we have to be able to ensure to our
9 families that anything that we release will not only be
10 in the best interest of their child but in the best
11 interest of children in that state.

12 MS. TSCHANTZ: So to keep us moving, did you
13 have something else from the regions, Beth?

14 Okay. To keep us moving, I have one question
15 that came from the regions that kind of takes us back
16 to (D), workforce knowledge and competency framework,
17 and then we'll turn it over to Miriam to talk about
18 special populations.

19 So the question is from I think Aisha
20 (phonetic), Region 9, "Please provide an example of how
21 workforce knowledge and competency framework would be
22 evidence based."

23 So this is one where we would encourage
24 applicants to look at the research base on the set of
25 skills and competencies that the workforce -- the early

1 childhood education workforce would need to have in
2 order to be effective. So we don't have any specific
3 examples that we would share. We would just encourage
4 you to look to the evidence base and the research base
5 on that.

6 And so with that, I'm going to turn it over
7 to Miriam.

8 MS. CALDERON: Hello again. Great. So we're
9 just going to ---
10 -- just a few comments on including special populations
11 of children, since we've gotten some questions on this.
12 First, on page 14 of your application, I want to draw
13 your attention to the definition of children with high
14 needs. So the definition describes low-income children
15 or other children in need of support. It talks about
16 specific groups of children but also leaves it open for
17 a state to discuss other special populations of
18 children who may also have high needs.

19 Some of the other questions that we've gotten
20 are about where and how to include children, special
21 populations of children throughout your application.
22 The first --
23 example is provided here as it relates to a high-
24 quality plan. You'll see that one of the elements of a
25 high-quality plan is addressing special populations of

1 children with high needs. And as you know and you've
2 heard today the term "high-quality plan" was discussed
3 multiple times, very often, in writing your responses
4 to your selection criteria. So that would mean that
5 again you would be addressing the needs [of special
6 populations] as part of every high-quality plan that
7 you submit. It is --
8 -- another area where you would be talking about and
9 describing children with high needs would be on Table
10 (A)(1)-2, page 28 and 29 of your application, where
11 you're asked to provide data on special populations of
12 children with high needs. Again, there are some groups
13 of children that are already written there, but you may
14 add to this table if you want.

15 And then you heard earlier from Jacqueline
16 when she talked about early learning standards and
17 comprehensive assessment systems. Again, in some areas
18 you're asked to speak about whether or not standards
19 are culturally and linguistically appropriate and again
20 where you are making decisions about assessments and
21 whether or not they are appropriate for the target
22 population that they're intended.

23 Finally over all, this competition's absolute
24 priority is about improving the quality of programs
25 that serve children with high needs in your state and

1 about increasing their readiness for school. As such,
2 reviewers will be evaluating the extent to which your
3 state has a plan that has a high likelihood of having a
4 positive impact on all of the children with high needs
5 in your state, including those from special
6 populations.

7 Any questions?

8 Great. With that, I'm going to turn it to my
9 colleague Beth to bring us into the homestretch.

10 MS. CARON: And before I move on to the next
11 slide I just want to catch us up on a couple of the
12 other questions that came in from the regions. And
13 similar to Jacqueline, I can't see you all when I'm
14 reading these, so apologies if I don't look at you and
15 can't see you signaling me.

16 One of the questions that came up was
17 regarding (E)(1)(e). "Does the assessment need to be
18 funded from development in significant part with other
19 funds or sustained with other funds?"

20 So I think the question is asking is it about
21 the difference between development and sustaining the
22 kindergarten entry assessment, using other funds for
23 that. And that's a case where the state -- you would
24 decide how you want to handle that. There's no --
25 nothing in the criterion that speaks to how you must

1 address that.

2 And the second part of the question, this is
3 from Phyllis in Rhode Island, can other Race to the Top
4 state grants -- these are the K-12 grants that are --
5 or actually they're beyond K-12 but these are the other
6 state grants -- can they be used to develop the
7 assessment if the K entry assessment was already
8 written into those statements of work?

9 And the answer is yes, you can use those
10 other Race to the Top funds for that purpose if that
11 was already in your plan.

12 And we also got a question back on (D). This
13 is about the high-quality plan. Would that high-
14 quality plan that's implemented, that's implemented
15 incentives -- this is about the work force incentives.
16 Sorry. Okay. So is the plan for implementing those,
17 does it need to include sustainability of those
18 incentives after the period of the grant ends?

19 And I think, like all of the other parts of
20 your plan we're looking for you to put things in place
21 that you'll be able to sustain over time because
22 there's not a lot of point in putting a lot of money
23 and effort and energy into pulling people together and
24 making tremendous effort if you aren't thinking also
25 about how it might lead into the future. So while it

1 may not specifically say that, and the reviewers might
2 not be looking specifically for it in a particular
3 criterion, they are looking for sustainability across
4 your whole plan. So that's something to just consider
5 as you're writing each of these criteria.

6 KAREN: So -- Karen from Minnesota.

7 So to the point of sustainability, we might
8 speculate and have high hopes about future resources
9 that may or may not be available four years from now.
10 Are there other things that we can build in to make a
11 case for sustainability other than just new money? I
12 mean can we -- is that sort of at our discretion to
13 convince the reviewers of why what our plan is is
14 sustainable?

15 MS. CARON: Yes. I mean I think that we're
16 really saying like to tell us your plan for
17 sustainability, that would obviously include funds for
18 a lot of this. But there are lots of ways to sustain
19 efforts, and I think that reviewers would appreciate
20 being able to hear all of your ideas.

21 And one last question which I think
22 reiterates something from this morning; I think it's a
23 good point to just bring us back before we move on to
24 the next slides. Region 10 asked a question. They
25 said, "It appears as though there's a preference or

1 incentive for already having something implemented,
2 some of the key elements of the high-quality plan
3 already implemented versus having plans to do that or
4 making progress toward putting the elements in place.
5 And they wanted a little clarity on that.

6 And as we discussed in this -- the discussion
7 about scoring rubric this morning, we are -- there is a
8 goal of implementation but a goal of implementation
9 that's high quality. So it's how those two factors
10 intersect that matters. And quality really trumps
11 implementation in the scoring rubric. So while
12 implementation is important, it's not important in and
13 of itself. It has to be done with quality. So I think
14 it's not an accurate representation to say that we're
15 any way incenting implementation over anything else.
16 It's all as a part and parcel, implementation with high
17 quality -- okay.

18 Okay. So now I'm moving on to my slides, and
19 let me find my little clicker. And I want to just talk
20 briefly about the invitational priorities, and we got a
21 question from Erica in Region 5 which speaks
22 immediately to my first point here. So we want to just
23 highlight that there are two invitational priorities in
24 this competition, and they're described in more detail
25 on pages 73 and 74 in your application, so read those

1 over. And we talked about one of them earlier, so if
2 you're going to plan to use that, make sure you speak
3 to it. If you're planning to think about using the
4 funds for an invitational priority, make sure you speak
5 to it in the application.

6 So these are areas that the departments both
7 are signaling that they have -- they're areas of strong
8 importance that we want to draw your attention to. You
9 can use grant funds to support these works, so you want
10 to make that clear in your application that you're
11 addressing these priorities and how you're doing that.
12 And the reviewers will read that, and they'll score it
13 in the mass of your entire plan. So they'll look at it
14 all together as part of your entire plan. But they
15 will not assign points specifically to the -- to the
16 invitational priorities because there are no points
17 associated with those.

18 So this is something we're signaling that's
19 important. We want you to think about how you might be
20 able to do these things. You can use grant funds for
21 them, but there are no points associated with them. So
22 hopefully that's clear enough.

23 But if there's any questions on that?

24 No? Okay.

25 I want to move us into the program

1 requirements. We talked about a couple of program
2 requirements earlier, so I want to just talk about a
3 couple more that are important to think about. Again,
4 program requirements are things that you have to do if
5 you receive a grant. These are things that will be in
6 place once you're funded, not before, not that you have
7 in place right now. Perhaps one of the most important
8 ones is this first bullet up there, that you need to
9 continue to participate in several programs that are
10 already -- that you're already engaged in now. Part B-
11 Section 619 of IDEA, Part C of IDEA, the CCDF program
12 and the Maternal and Infant Child Health Home Visiting
13 program. I think I said it a little bit wrong. We
14 never -- Maternal-Infant Early Childhood Health -- no,
15 Early Childhood Home Visiting. Thank you. You guys
16 know it way better than I do. I only know it by its
17 acronym, but I don't even know how to pronounce the --
18 MIECHV.

19 (Laughter)

20 MS. CARON: So I'm thinking it's Eastern
21 European, but I'm not actually sure. You have to
22 remain in those programs for the entire length of your
23 four-year grant.

24 The second one that I want to draw your
25 attention to is (j), and this came up as a question

1 earlier, and we want to make sure we address this point
2 specifically. The funds that are made available under
3 this grant, under the RTT-ELC grant, must be used to
4 supplement and not supplant any federal, state or local
5 funds that in the absence of these funds awarded under
6 the grant would be available for increased -- let me
7 start again because that just -- I paused at the wrong
8 place, and I threw myself off.

9 So funds made available under the RTT-ELC
10 grant must be used to supplement and not supplant any
11 federal, state or local funds that in the absence of
12 the grant funds would be available for increasing
13 access to and improving the quality of early learning
14 and development programs.

15 And the question that came up specifically
16 from one of the regions was does that apply to all four
17 years? And the answer is yes, that applies to all four
18 years. You can't supplant just this year and then, you
19 know, -- and then supplant next year and supplant the
20 year -- you cannot supplant at any point during the
21 grant. So hopefully that's clear.

22 We already discussed a couple of the other
23 program requirements, but just to highlight them again,
24 one of the others is that you have to set aside the
25 money for the technical assistance. You have 90 days

1 to finalize your scopes of work. And while we talked
2 about that before and the flexibility that allows, but
3 it also is a program requirement that you do have to
4 finalize your scopes of work. So at some point we're
5 looking for final scopes of work.

6 I know. I don't really need to say it.

7 We also talked about the prohibition on
8 direct healthcare services, and there's also one in
9 there about complying with privacy laws. But one of
10 the ones that's not on this screen that I want to make
11 sure I point out for you is that there is no program
12 requirement for a program evaluation. We are not
13 requiring you to have a program evaluation, and there
14 was some confusion when we talked about validation
15 versus evaluation. And when we're talking about a
16 program evaluation, there is no requirement for that.
17 There is language in the program requirements on
18 page 95 that says if we -- if there's funding made
19 available through federal sources, and we engage in
20 some kind of evaluation with HHS and ED, we want you to
21 participate in that. So there are -- there's some
22 language about your participating in something that may
23 occur down the line. But you are not required to, on
24 your own, come up with an evaluation of your program.
25 So hopefully that is also clear.

1 Questions on that before I move on to the
2 really fun stuff?

3 You had a question right up front.

4 MS. HAWLEY: Hi. Theresa Hawley.

5 Is there any prohibition on using the funds
6 from this for any particular evaluation or research
7 purpose because -- in the past some Department of Ed
8 grants putting in something that could be construed as
9 "research" then was declared a non-allowable expense?

10 MS. CARON: Oh, yeah. No, there's nothing in
11 here that says you cannot evaluate your program, and if
12 you want to use funds to evaluate your program, you
13 know, that makes -- yeah. There's nothing to preclude
14 that.

15 Then we had one in the front row.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You referred earlier
17 back on slide 54 to something EDGAR about -- when you
18 talked about the exclusion of health services, about
19 things that money could not be -- can you tell me what
20 that references --

21 MS. CARON: Oh. I probably said EDGAR but
22 what I meant was the OMB circular. I make those --
23 sorry. EDGAR is our education regulations. But
24 there's an OMB circular, and I think it's A-21 -- A-87.
25 Sorry. I don't not have my OMB circulars memorized.

1 But it actually delineates what are allowable costs.

2 And that's something else I wanted to just
3 mention. We also got a question from one of the
4 regions about are these costs allowable; are those
5 costs allowable? We're -- it's too hard for us to get
6 into the specifics of what every question is around
7 what's allowable, but there is a circular that
8 delineates it pretty clearly. But also there are people
9 in your state who are doing this work. If you have any
10 questions, talk to them about what are the allowable
11 costs? Are they reasonable? Are they allowable? Are
12 they permissible? So -- and that's all pretty clearly
13 laid out in the OMB circular.

14 So -- okay. Other questions on that?

15 Okay. Let me move on then to planning
16 considerations. A lot of these things you've already
17 seen, and we had a similar slide in the webinar. We
18 just want to remind you if you haven't already--
19 determine who your lead agency is and who your
20 participating agencies are, so you can start getting
21 MOUs together; you can start working on your budgets if
22 you have not already. This is more just a reminder
23 slide than anything else so that it's in the packet and
24 with the rest of the information. And also remember
25 that you've got a lot of signatures to get, so make

1 sure you allow for some time to get those signatures.

2 And now I want to talk a little bit more
3 about the actual logistics of submitting your
4 application. And this is the sort of fun stuff for me
5 because I'm going to be at the other receiving end of
6 it. So one of the questions that we got that I just
7 want to help folks think about right now is in the
8 application we gave you a Word document application
9 that you fill out, and there are text boxes where
10 you'll put in your narrative text. And folks have said
11 well, what if we have a graph that we can't just embed
12 in a text box, and it doesn't really work that easily?

13 It doesn't have to have a box around it. You
14 don't have to be that rigid about it. But we want you
15 to remember everywhere that there's one of those text
16 boxes that the reviewers are going to be expecting a
17 narrative. So it doesn't have to have a box around it.
18 It doesn't have to look exactly like what's in there.
19 But it is a reminder you do need a narrative where each
20 of those places occurs. So if you have a graph, embed
21 a graph. It's not a problem to not have it in a text
22 box. So I just want to make sure that people know
23 where they have that flexibility.

24 Also an important reminder is that this
25 application needs to come to us on a CD or a DVD. And

1 preferably you have your entire application in one PDF
2 file. And we want it to be a PDF because that secures
3 it for you, so you know it's not changed after, you
4 know, it gets into the mail services or anything, but
5 also that it's consistent and that it's complete.

6 If we have multiple files, we may miss one.
7 Someone may miss one. You may not get one on your
8 disk, and then a part of your application would be
9 missing. So we're asking you to please put it all in
10 one file in a PDF format so --

11 And we had a question in the back?

12 MS. PARK: Yes. Jennifer Park from Florida.

13 I have a question about one of the assurances
14 regarding the Attorney General's assurance. And I'm
15 going to read from our general counsel's question,
16 since this is beyond my expertise.

17 "Other federally funded programs have
18 included a requirement that the state Attorney General
19 certify that the criteria for the program are met. In
20 certain circumstance, the Florida Attorney General has
21 had no direct authority over the programs in question.
22 In that case, can they designate the agency's general
23 counsel that authority?"

24 MS. CARON: That's one I'm not even going to
25 try to answer. I'm going to turn right to my Office of

1 General Counsel because -- and I don't know if we have
2 an immediate answer or if we want to talk --

3 MS. HESS: I think the answer -- this is Jane
4 from Education.

5 I think the answer is no. We've been pretty
6 specific, and there is I think a little more detail in
7 one of the FAQs (B-5) It has to be an authorized
8 representative of the Attorney General, and we didn't
9 mean that you can kind of pick somebody else that's not
10 associated with that office.

11 MS. PARK: So if the general counsel acts as
12 the authorized agent in programmatic areas specific to
13 this, they would not have that authority; it would
14 still need to come from the state Attorney General?

15 MS. CARON: I think that's right.

16 MS. PARK: It would have to come from the
17 state Attorney General or the state Attorney General's
18 Office, just to be clear?

19 MS. HESS: Right.

20 MS. CARON: Yeah.

21 MS. PARK: Correct. Yes.

22 MS. HESS: The authorized representative of
23 the AG.

24 MS. PARK: Okay. Thank you.

25 MS. WEISS: And it's because they're signing

1 an assurance that's about the state laws. It's not
2 because they have jurisdiction over the money or
3 anything for this program. The assurance they're
4 signing is about the state law, and the Attorney
5 General is the person in the state who is authorized to
6 interpret what the state laws are about. So they're
7 just looking at your application and making sure that
8 wherever you've referred to the state's laws you've
9 done so in an accurate fashion. That's the assurance
10 that they're signing. It's not about jurisdiction over
11 your programs.

12 MS. CARON: Does that answer your question?
13 You look --

14 Okay. Good. Just want to make sure.

15 We have another --

16 MS. BARRETT: Hi. Leanne from New Mexico.

17 How should we address appendices in the
18 application? Should they also be in a single PDF file,
19 or can we have multiple files for the appendices?

20 MS. CARON: Ideally -- I mean again, think
21 about it in terms of what's going to make sure it gets
22 here in the easiest, most secure way that also gets
23 translated into -- sent to reviewers so that the
24 reviewers can read. If it's one PDF of your appendix,
25 it's more likely to stay together in the order that you

1 want it in and all the rest, so if at all possible, I
2 mean we're not going to throw it out if it doesn't come
3 that way. But the problem is if we have each of your
4 ten appendices in a different file, and they get mixed
5 up or they get -- then you can't guarantee the way the
6 reviewers are seeing your information.

7 So this is really about making sure that what
8 you present is exactly what the reviewers see. So
9 that's why we're asking for it in a particular way.
10 But you must put it on a CD or DVD. That's the non-
11 negotiable part of it.

12 And we're also asking you, as I mentioned
13 earlier when we talked about the budget, to put that
14 budget workbook on there as well. So save that on
15 there. And it can be in an Excel file. It doesn't
16 have to be in a PDF.

17 I also want to remind you that there are
18 signatures that are required, and you do need to send
19 us an original copy of the signatures, and you do need
20 to do that -- an original, signed form with actual pen
21 and paper, not auto-penned or anything else, and a copy
22 of those signatures. So that will be the one piece
23 that's not on your electronic CD or DVD. So that might
24 all go in the same packet, but it doesn't have to be
25 electronic.

1 And we had a question right up in front? Do
2 you have a microphone? Oh, we have one -- I can't --
3 oh, sorry.

4 JILLIAN: That's okay. This is Jillian from
5 Wyoming.

6 And I know that the page limits are
7 recommendations but also keeping in mind brevity and
8 wherever we can truncate information. For the
9 narratives, okay, the graphs can be inserted, not
10 embedded. The narratives fit into a box which kind of
11 messes with the one-inch margins --

12 MS. CARON: Well, that's what I was saying.
13 It doesn't have to be a box.

14 JILLIAN: Okay. So we can delete the box
15 also, not just the graphs can be inserted, but we can
16 also insert our text and take away the box.

17 MS. CARON: You can get rid of the actual
18 physical box.

19 JILLIAN: Okay.

20 MS. CARON: Yeah, because the idea of the box
21 is to let you know here's a space where you'll need to
22 be writing something. You don't have to physically
23 write it in that box. You can write narrative, da da
24 da da, and there's all your text, and then delete the
25 physical box. That doesn't matter to us. We just want

1 to signal to you that there is a narrative, and it will
2 go in, somewhere in that place. So yes, get rid of the
3 box, and write the text in whatever way you need to
4 write the text. Put your graph in there wherever you
5 need to put it in. So --

6 And there was another question in the middle
7 as well. Oh, and one at the front. Sorry.

8 CHARLENE: Charlene, Connecticut.

9 Just to clarify and question back to what she
10 mentioned on the appendices, so you're really
11 considering the appendix a part of the -- your
12 application in that first bullet --

13 MS. CARON: The body of your application is
14 really all of your narrative and your tables and all of
15 the rest. And then your appendices can be separate
16 from the body of the application. So you could have
17 two PDFs if that's the way that you want to do it with
18 your applications being separate. Right. If you want
19 to put the whole thing together into one PDF, it's
20 probably huge, but you're welcome to do that. That's
21 great because then you know your appendices are all
22 tied together. But it doesn't, it doesn't necessarily
23 have to be every, everything in one. But to the extent
24 that that's possible I'm just, you know, I just want
25 you to know why it matters. So it's for your benefit

1 more than anything to do it that way. Okay.

2 So -- and there's just a couple of other
3 specifics on here. Just take a look at this chart.
4 Put the CFDA number on the envelope. We also -- you
5 need to either hand-deliver or overnight mail this
6 application. Those are the only ways we can get it. I
7 strongly recommend you overnight mail it, and the
8 reason I say that is because if you hand-deliver it
9 then someone has to be at the security desk at the
10 other building to actually accept it. And if you all
11 remember this morning coming in through security, if
12 they don't know you're coming it can delay it. It can
13 be somewhat problematic. So to whatever extent you can
14 send it via overnight mail that's the preferable
15 method.

16 And there are different addresses that you
17 send it to if you use those -- either one of those
18 methods. So read the application and see which address
19 you're sending it to.

20 And whatever you do, do not send one to each.
21 Do not send one overnight and one hand-delivered,
22 because then one of them we have to throw out because
23 we can only accept one, and we're hoping that they're
24 identical and that we're throwing out something that's
25 identical. But if for some reason they weren't then

1 that's gone. So just make sure you don't try to cover
2 your bases by sending, you know, one via each method
3 and, you know, one by horse and one by, you know,
4 camel. So that's just another quickie.

5 And just another, going to say it, you know,
6 again and again and again, we need to receive these,
7 not postmarked but received, by October 19th at 4:30
8 Eastern Time. That's when we need to receive them.
9 That's when they have to come into our, you know,
10 mailroom downstairs. So just make sure you keep that
11 in mind.

12 And then I just wanted to give you a minute
13 overview of what happens once we receive them. So this
14 is just a little bit of a highlight about the
15 application review process itself. As we talked about
16 before, we have independent peer reviewers who are
17 reviewing these applications, a panel of five
18 reviewers. If -- and we mentioned before it's not the
19 exact same five reviewers reviewing this application
20 and that application and that application. We're
21 mixing up the panel reviewers so that we don't have any
22 systemic bias. But each reviewer will read probably
23 three applications. They're being vetted for conflicts
24 of interest, and we're making sure that there's no one
25 with a conflict of interest and no one from the state

1 that they live in is going to be reviewing the
2 application that came from their state. So there's
3 lots of pieces that we're making sure we cover.

4 They will get an extensive training. It's
5 like two-day training, so they get what you guys get
6 except we, you know, make them work really hard, and
7 they actually have to practice writing out responses
8 and that kind of stuff. So they also have to get
9 trained in the system that they're going to be actually
10 entering the scores and comments into, so it takes a
11 little bit longer.

12 But they'll get the same content information
13 that you got. They'll get the same FAQs. So they
14 won't have any secret information that you guys don't
15 have, but we want to make sure that they hear exactly
16 what you heard so that they understand the criteria in
17 the same way that you did.

18 And then I just want to remind you that all
19 of the applications and as well as the reviewers'
20 scores and reviewer comments will all be posted on our
21 website after the competition. So do not include any
22 personally identifiable information in your application
23 because that all has to be vetted out. You know, so
24 just keep that in mind as you're writing things.

25 And just again the competition timeline, this

1 is just for you to have as reference. And here are
2 some resources that will be up for a minute. I'm going
3 to just say thank you all for tolerating and sitting
4 through all this and giving us your great questions.
5 This is really helpful. I'm going to turn it over to
6 Joan and Jacqueline to do a quick closing and then see
7 if we have any other questions.

8 Are there any other questions about the
9 application process --

10 Yes, go ahead. Sorry.

11 MS. MINZENBERG: Hi. Barb from Pennsylvania.

12 We also had our attorneys look at the MOUs,
13 and that raised the question for them about the lead
14 agency. And they wanted a definition of state level,
15 and I'm thinking it's statewide responsibility.

16 They're thinking it's the department level like
17 education or welfare or transportation or whatever.

18 MS. CARON: I don't know if we -- I think
19 that's one we'll --

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ask the question
21 again.

22 MS. CARON: Yeah. Can you ask the question
23 again?

24 MS. MINZENBERG: What is the definition of
25 state level?

1 MS. CARON: Is state level a --

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In what context?

3 MS. CARON: In terms of the lead agency. So
4 is the lead -- what does it mean to be state level in
5 terms of the lead agency? Do you have to be a
6 department, or do you have to be statewide in your
7 influence? Like --

8 MS. MINZENBERG: Can it be an office having
9 statewide --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- the governor's
11 office --

12 MS. CARON: Right. So -- if the governor's
13 office can be one then that has like statewide
14 influence. So I don't think it's -- we haven't said it
15 has to be this department and that department and that
16 department. It's whatever the agencies are that
17 administer those programs. So I'm not sure if I
18 understand, and maybe it needs to be a lawyer talking
19 to a lawyer to really get the nuance of your question.

20 MS. MINZENBERG: All right.

21 MS. CARON: Yeah.

22 MS. MINZENBERG: Thank you.

23 MS. CARON: Sorry.

24 Any other questions before we --

25 No? Okay. I'll turn it over to Joan and

1 Jacqueline.

2 DR. JONES: So I'm shocked that I still see
3 eyes open and smiling faces. We want to thank you so
4 much for being here, for asking these really thoughtful
5 questions. This has been an extraordinarily exciting
6 event for us. We hope that we've answered some of your
7 questions, and there still is opportunity to get some
8 of them answered.

9 I think one of the things that struck me as
10 we went through these questions today was how important
11 it is to look at the criteria, how important it is to
12 really, really look at those criteria. Remember that
13 that's what the reviewers are going to be looking at.
14 So if you get a sense that there is some kind of subtle
15 nuance, you've got some question, go right back to the
16 criteria and see what the reviewers are going to be
17 looking at. I think that can be extremely helpful. We
18 get caught in the weeds, but the criteria matter. And
19 think about the reviewers. Think about the ways in
20 which they're going to be needing clarity. They're
21 going to need organization. They're going to need to
22 have a clear sense of what's going on. But again, I
23 come back to the criteria.

24 So we'll have time for a few more questions,
25 but I just want to thank you so much for your interest

1 in this and the notion that we're all here to do this
2 extraordinary thing, and that is to align these
3 programs, to really build quality and to do what's best
4 for young children and their families.

5 DR. LOMBARDI: So do we have any -- before I
6 really close it out, do we have any final questions?

7 We have a question right there?

8 MS. HAMMER: Yes. My name is Pat Hammer from
9 West Virginia. And I have a question about the Budget
10 Table II-1. It's slide number 51 in your presentation.
11 And I just wondered if you could talk a little bit
12 about what would go on line 6, the contractual line,
13 compared with what would go on line 11, the funds to be
14 distributed to locations, etc.? I just want to
15 understand for sure what's contracted and, you know, I
16 think this is kind of related to the grants versus
17 contracts question but not really. And I think it has
18 more to do with what is flow-through or wouldn't be
19 subject to the indirect cost.

20 MS. CARON: Well, the indirect cost is
21 another piece that you need to look at carefully
22 because you can, you can claim indirect cost on up to
23 \$25,000 of each contract. So you have to look at that
24 as a separate piece.

25 But the difference between line 6 and line 11

1 is when you're looking at what you're going to route
2 through to your locals, to your intermediary
3 organizations, to your program level, like the program
4 level people, that will all go in that lower line, it's
5 line 11. I can't remember off the top of my head now.
6 And then whatever else you're going to be contracting
7 for, so you may be contracting for some much more
8 global things that are going to reach across your
9 state. Those would be in your contracts line in 6.

10 So the difference really is the money that's
11 going to your locals to implement things - that are
12 going to be carrying out activities of your plan -
13 goes in that local line 11. And then the rest of your
14 contracting work that's going toward an outside
15 contractor to do some piece of the QRIS work, for
16 example, that's going to go in line 6.

17 So does that help?

18 MS. HAMMER: Yes. Thank you.

19 MS. RUDISILL: This is Shannon answering a
20 couple of questions that came in from New York State
21 remotely. So these go back to the QRIS, TQRIS
22 presentation Table (B)(2)(c). The first question is
23 where we ask folks to list the different places
24 children are cared for. Nicholas notes that these are
25 not mutually exclusive program categories, and so there

1 could be duplicate counting. And the answer is we know
2 that there is duplication, and that is why there is not
3 a total at the bottom of the table.

4 And the second question is about -- so we ask
5 in this proportion that we have here, in this Table
6 (B)(2)(c) about the programs in the state relative to
7 the number that are participating in the QRIS. He
8 wanted a little more clarification about whether or not
9 we're talking about -- I think his examples are
10 helpful. Is it blank percent of all Head Start
11 programs are participating in the QRIS, or is it blank
12 percent of the programs in the QRIS are Head Start
13 programs?

14 Okay. So the answer to that is the
15 denominator is the total of each program type in the
16 state. So it is, for example, the -- there's, you
17 know, I'm going to make up a percentage. There's
18 15 percent of all the Early Head Start and Head Start
19 programs in our state are enrolled in the QRIS. Does
20 that make sense?

21 Okay.

22 MS. TSCHANTZ: Okay. We have follow-up.

23 MS. WHITEHOUSE: Hi. Good afternoon.

24 Elizabeth Whitehouse with Kentucky.

25 I was just going to ask for clarification on

1 the lead state agency, make sure that we'd be in
2 compliance. Our Office of Early Childhood is attached
3 to our state advisory council. Would that work --
4 excuse me, the governor's Office of Early Childhood.
5 Would that -- could we use that to serve as our lead
6 state agency?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

8 MS. WHITEHOUSE: Okay. Great.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

10 MS. TSCHANTZ: We had another question from
11 the regions from Betty in South Carolina, and this is
12 around competitive preference priority number 3, the
13 kindergarten entry assessment. And Betty asks for
14 clarification on how a state can score 70 percent or
15 higher on (E)(1) if the state hasn't yet implemented a
16 kindergarten entry assessment.

17 And here she's jumped ahead and already
18 looked at the quality implementation rubric which is
19 used for (E)(1). Reviewers will be guided to take a
20 look at that rubric. And Betty, you are correct that
21 to earn 70 percent of the points your state must
22 demonstrate to the reviewers that you have partially
23 implemented something in a high-quality manner. So
24 take a close look at that, and look at that rubric.

25 DR. JONES: I have a couple of other

1 kindergarten entry questions. So this is from Barbara
2 in Chicago. "Is the kindergarten readiness assessment
3 intended to target high-need children, which is the
4 focus of this grant, or is the expectation that the
5 assessment be performed on all children, including
6 those not identified as high need?"

7 The assumption is that all children will
8 be -- in public schools -- will be part of this
9 kindergarten entry assessment.

10 The second question is also from Barbara in
11 Chicago. "What if a state wants to use a more in-depth
12 literacy assessment complemented by a work sampling,
13 teacher-given assessment that measures other domains?"

14 "What if a state wants to use a more in-depth
15 literacy assessment complemented by a work sampling,
16 teacher-given assessment that measures other domains?"

17 So I assume this means, Barbara, the
18 assessment will have lots of domains, but you want to
19 have something else that focuses more on literacy. So
20 using two assessments, but the same assessments in all
21 kindergarteners, statewide, covering all domains.
22 That's perfectly fine. Again, I think for the
23 kindergarten entry assessment, we've had so many
24 questions, go back to the criteria. You know, it says
25 a common statewide kindergarten entry assessment that

1 informs instruction and the like. So think about how
2 you would do that, and think about what the reviewers
3 are going to be looking at. But multiple domains, how
4 you want to get to those multiple domains in the most
5 efficient way.

6 MS. CALDERON: Hi. We had a question from
7 Christine in New York State. And this is about our
8 favorite table, (A)(1)-4. Christine would like some
9 clarity on the following. "A claims-based
10 reimbursement program like Part B program in our state
11 may incur costs in year one but not make disbursement
12 to pay those obligations until the next year or next
13 several years. Do we count the spending as having
14 occurred in the year the obligation was incurred or
15 when the disbursements were made?"

16 So Christine, our advice is to make a
17 decision about how you want to handle this and then be
18 consistent in what you report across funding streams
19 and years. You also may want to explain what you did
20 in the bottom row of the table. Remember, this table
21 is providing information to the reviewer about
22 historical investments in early learning and
23 development programs. You want to be -- you want to
24 ensure that you paint a clear picture for the reviewer.

25 DR. LOMBARDI: Other questions? Other

1 questions from the regions?

2 Everyone is quiet back there.

3 MR. HAGGARD: I'm sorry. I have a --

4 DR. LOMBARDI: Dan?

5 MR. HAGGARD: -- question and a comment I
6 guess. Because most of what we're going to be
7 proposing, at least for us, is within the constraints
8 of federal regulation law and guidelines, are you at
9 the federal level willing to consider requests for
10 waivers that will make the work of this proposal, the
11 intent of the proposal --

12 DR. LOMBARDI: Well --

13 MR. HAGGARD: -- fulfill the intent?

14 DR. LOMBARDI: You want to answer it or --

15 I mean we can only issue waivers where we
16 have waiver authority. So just --

17 MR. HAGGARD: Okay. So we would have to
18 basically --

19 DR. LOMBARDI: -- that's the foremost thing
20 that you need to keep in mind.

21 MR. HAGGARD: Should --

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're certainly
23 willing to entertain it --

24 DR. LOMBARDI: Right. We're willing --

25 MR. HAGGARD: I guess the --

1 DR. LOMBARDI: -- to entertain it where we
2 have waiver authority.

3 MR. HAGGARD: Okay. So --

4 DR. LOMBARDI: But we have to be very clear
5 where we have waiver authority.

6 MR. HAGGARD: So if we're -- I guess we need
7 to make that inquiry prior to or during the process of
8 writing our proposal.

9 DR. LOMBARDI: You can remember -- continue
10 to ask questions, and we'll continue to try to get you
11 answers. But I think -- I don't know if you want to
12 add anything, Joanne.

13 MS. WEISS: Yes. If there's something that
14 you are contemplating waiving as part of your
15 application, and you want to send an email to our Race
16 to the Top - Early Learning inbox asking us for a
17 specific area whether we've got waiver authority, we're
18 happy to answer those questions for you wherever we
19 can. So just be specific in what waiver you would need
20 us to do and in what program, and we can let you know
21 whether we've got the authority to do that or not.

22 DR. LOMBARDI: And of course, even if it came
23 from a single state we would make sure that the answer
24 is available to all of you so you'd all be seeing --

25 MS. WEISS: Yeah. The other thing we should

1 say is just because we have waiver authority doesn't
2 guarantee that we give -- that isn't granting the
3 waiver. We have to go through a process to grant the
4 waiver. But it just tells you that you can ask us for
5 a waiver in that area, and if you put it in the
6 application it would be a credible request.

7 MS. TSCHANTZ: So one other thing that might
8 be helpful in terms of us being able to communicate
9 information quickly, because we know that time is of
10 the essence and tight, is, you know, we're asking for
11 you guys to think about designating a lead person in
12 your state so when we send out more information that --
13 to make sure that everybody's got that and if you could
14 just -- is the easiest way to do that, email the box, ,
15 the RTT - Early Learning Challenge inbox, and that
16 email address should be in the PowerPoint. Oh, and
17 there it is. Look at that. It's at the bottom,
18 rtt.early.learning.challenge@ed.gov. And if you just
19 email us, for the state of whatever, here's the one
20 contact person, then we'll create an email list to make
21 sure everybody gets information in a timely way.

22 The other piece is we have lots of Power-
23 Point handouts still available, so if you want to take
24 any home with you for any of your friends, they're at
25 the registration desk.

1 DR. LOMBARDI: Okay. Going once or twice,
2 that's -- we're going to close out the questions. One
3 more time. We want you to be completely satisfied.

4 (Laughter)

5 DR. LOMBARDI: Well, I want to close this by
6 first telling you the biggest compliment I think I've
7 heard today and that is, you know, it's seamless. We
8 can't tell who works for which department. And I want
9 to thank -- have you thank with me the incredible team
10 that put this together.

11 (Applause)

12 DR. LOMBARDI: They are united and
13 particularly what we call affectionately the group of
14 six, Beth and -- the G6, yeah. Beth Caron and Jennifer
15 Tschantz and Steven Hicks and Richard Gonzales, Ngozi
16 Onunaku and Miriam Calderon. They have done just
17 incredible work of trying to really stay every day,
18 meet, talk, make sure we're answering your questions,
19 and they'll continue to do that.

20 We all, many of us, have been working on a
21 real long road in early childhood, and I hope that
22 you're feeling as much as we're feeling that you're a
23 part of history, that this is a critical step forward
24 and, you know, Jacqueline and I started this journey
25 together a few years ago, and we're just so proud to be

1 here with you and to share this with you.

2 I guess I want to close with three hopes. My
3 first hope is that you keep an open mind, and you
4 listen to each other. I know that you're working
5 across agencies or different cultures different
6 language, different histories, and I hope that you
7 reflect with each other every day and learn from each
8 other and listen. It's always -- it's sometimes
9 difficult, but I think you get a better response for
10 children.

11 Secondly, that this moves your state forward.
12 As far as I'm concerned we all -- you can all be
13 winners. We're going to do everything we can once
14 these are chosen to have a 50-state strategy so that
15 we're taking the lessons that are learned from the
16 states that may receive the grants, the states that
17 will move forward even if they don't receive the grants
18 and get that out through the state advisory councils,
19 through the CCDF grantees, through the IDEA grantees.
20 We're into creating a learning community that's going
21 to have a wave across the country. That's what this
22 is.

23 And I'll close with my third hope which is
24 that this ends up having more happy, healthy and
25 successful children because that's the real goal. Keep

1 it in front of you.

2 Thank you. Safe travel.

3 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at
4 6 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in the matter of:

RACE TO THE TOP

EARLY LEARNING CHALLENGE

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO APPLICANTS WORKSHOP

PLACE: Washington, D.C.

DATE: September 13, 2011

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof.

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 410-974-0947

Timothy J. Atkinson, Jr.
Free State Reporting, Inc.

Karen Ehatt
Transcriber