

# Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge

## 2015 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



JUNE 2016





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

**Oregon**

2015

Due: February 29, 2016

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

**Paperwork Burden Statement**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0713. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0713. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3E320, Washington, DC 20202-6200.



## Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

B(1) Developing and Adopting a Common, Statewide TQRIS

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

B(3) Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs

B(4) Promoting Access to High-Quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

D(1) Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and Progression of Credentials

D(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in Improving their Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities.

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

E(2) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



## Performance Report: Cover Sheet

### General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A130030-13A

2. Grantee Name Early Learning Division, Oregon Department of Education

3. Grantee Address 775 Summer St NE  
City: Salem  
State: Oregon Zip: 97301

4. Project Director Name: Megan Irwin  
Title: Early Learning System Director  
Phone #: 503-378-2755 Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax #: 503-947-1955  
Email: megan.irwin@state.ode.or.us

### Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2015 To: 12/31/2015

### Indirect Cost Information

#### 6. Indirect Costs

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

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

Approving Federal agency:  ED  HHS  Other Specify other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

## Executive Summary

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

### **INTRODUCTION**

Oregon continues to make great strides in efforts to create a dynamic early learning system capable of anticipating and addressing the myriad needs of children and families. Efforts are guided by the state's 40-40-20 goals: by 2040, 40% of adult Oregonians will earn a bachelor's degree or higher; 40% will earn an associate's degree; and 20% will earn a high school diploma or equivalent. Oregon's early learning system aims to support children to learn and thrive by focusing on three statutory goals: ensure that 1) children arrive at kindergarten ready to succeed; 2), families are healthy, stable and attached; and 3) the early learning system is coordinated, aligned and family-centered.

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

### **ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

The 2015 Annual Performance Report offers highlights from the third year of Oregon's RTT-ELC grant. As the following highlights show, we have had a very productive year.

#### **Building an Equity-Driven System**

A major theme of year three was equity and the employment of culturally responsive policies and practices that ensure that Oregon's children and families have access to services that align with their cultural and linguistic needs. The Early Learning Council's Equity Subcommittee created recommendations in 2014, which were operationalized in 2015 through the creation of four workgroups charged with developing and implementing plans that address the following areas:

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

Focusing on these four areas has resulted in individual, institutional, and structural changes that build the foundation to accomplish the early learning goals. Examples of successful equity efforts include: the translation of materials for the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) and VROOM - a set of tools and messages, which includes an free app for smart phones, that empowers parents and caregivers to turn everyday moments into brain building moments; targeted recruitment and training of culturally responsive programs for professional development; and the availability of developmental and Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework program trainings in languages

other than English, including Spanish and Russian.

## **Establishing Successful State Systems**

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

### Early Learning Council

The Early Learning Council continues to guide the policy, direction and development of the early learning system. In 2015, Oregon's new Governor, Kate Brown, appointed Megan Irwin as the Early Learning Systems Director to support the momentum for systems development under her leadership as the Acting Director.

### Early Learning Hubs

The Early Learning Hub system, launched in 2013, continued to advance in 2015. Each region of the state is now covered by one of 16 Hubs. Hubs are responsible for bringing together partners from early childhood, K-12 education, health, human services, and the business sectors around a common vision and shared measurable outcomes for children and families. While Hubs are at different stages of development, they are all responsible for identifying children for whom the existing system has not sufficiently prepared for kindergarten. They work with families to not only identify needs, but also connect them to community resources. A major aspect of Hubs is its emphasis on measurable outcomes that are shared across systems, moving beyond a fragmented system to one that is coordinated, aligned, and collectively accountable to our children and families. RTT-ELC funding has been instrumental in efforts to develop the decentralized Early Learning Hub system by adding staff and resource capacity to work with and train Hub leaders.

### Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement is a value and is essential to our efforts to build a world-class early learning system. In 2015, "Principles of Community Engagement" were developed and implemented to ensure that our work incorporates and reflects the input of myriad stakeholders impacted by our work. RTT-ELC funding has helped us to build staff capacity to develop and lead this work.

In addition, we are working with the Bezos Foundation to introduce and roll out Vroom statewide. Vroom is a national early learning initiative that provides parents and caregivers of young children with science-based brain building activities. To-date, grants have gone out to 25 pilot sites, including early learning Hubs, Head Start programs, Tribes, and other government and community organizations.

### Legislative Highlights

2015 was an exciting year for early learning in Oregon. The legislature allocated over \$100 million in new investments in the early learning system. Legislation created Preschool Promise, our state's new mixed delivery preschool program that is currently under development. Oregon's child care subsidy program, Employment Related Day Care (ERDC), was also strengthened. Changes include:

- Effective October 2015, the state provides one year of protected eligibility so families are able to sustain child care when changes in income or work hours occur.



- By linking ERDC to TQRIS, families who use TQRIS providers pay reduced co-pays and the providers receive enhanced reimbursement (tiered reimbursement), effective April 2016.
- Effective October 2015, ERDC allows working parents taking college credits to qualify for the subsidy;
- Authorized on-site health and safety monitoring of license-exempt providers receiving ERDC funding, in accordance with new federal regulations;
- Created opportunities for license-exempt providers to learn evidence-based practices to improve the quality of the care they receive.

Staff was recently hired to implement the system of quality supports.

Administrative rule promulgation for on-site health and safety monitoring of license-exempt providers is scheduled to formally begin May 2016 and on track for implementation by early summer.

These reforms are helping to support families experiencing poverty to participate in the workforce; promote positive child development; and increase the number of children in quality child care environments. These state investments - especially Preschool Promise and tiered reimbursements - are essential to our ability to sustain the work initiated using RTT-ELC funds. Further, these investments are possible because of the RTT-ELC investment in the TQRIS.

Early Learning Hubs also received new funds to enhance their capacity to meet the needs of children and families in the communities they serve. State investments were also made in Kindergarten Partnership and Innovation, Healthy Families Oregon (home visiting) and Relief Nursery programs.

### **Defining High-Quality, Accountable Programs**

RTT-ELC funding has been instrumental in efforts to operationalize Oregon's TQRIS, a key strategy for achieving the system goal of ensuring that children arrive at kindergarten ready to learn. This is accomplished through the expansion of the supply of and access to high quality Early Learning and Development Programs (ELDP). 2015 was marked by a strong focus on reaching culturally responsive providers through the development and distribution of materials in languages other than English, e.g., Spanish and Russian. Programs serving communities of color and rural communities were also targeted for trainings. Regional Hubs play an important part in operationalizing TQRIS, through their role in convening a cross section of early childhood partners, identifying targeted communities and children poorly served through the current early learning system, and connecting families to quality services.

### Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System

Since its launch in 2013, the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System has reached 25% of licensed child care programs and 67% of Head Start programs in Oregon. The penetration rate has resulted in increased attainment of professional development credentials and has advanced Oregon's progress towards positively impacting the quality of ELDP serving Oregon's children.

### Professional Development

Oregon maintained its commitment to creating a system that provides high quality practitioner training, including a master trainer program and local, regional, and statewide training opportunities. A virtual training model was piloted with a trainer in one location and a facilitator and participants in a second location as a strategy for reaching culturally specific and rural providers. Technical assistance (TA) providers continued to receive training and support through the central coordination model in order to provide quality improvement TA to programs.

The legislation that authorized reduced copays for families receiving subsidy will be implemented in the summer of 2016. Since 2013, parents choosing programs offering

contracted slots subsidy had a reduced co-payment, owing the minimum allowable \$27. The highest subsidy reimbursement rate was paid to these programs for these slots, regardless of charge or age. As a result of our focus on equity and the implementation of key strategies in 2015, we improved access to and the quality of programs serving children with high needs.

### **Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children**

Oregon continues to engage a cross section of stakeholders and partners and work towards the development and implementation of shared goals that support our system goals of kindergarten readiness, attached and stable families and coordinated, family-centered systems.

#### Standards Alignment

The standards alignment work underway in Oregon would not be possible but for the RTT-ELC investment. The Standards Alignment workgroup was created in 2015. In addition to language, literacy, and mathematics, the workgroup has prioritized ensuring alignment between kindergarten standards for social emotional development and approaches to learning. Through a broad recruitment of workgroup members, we are working to align Oregon's Early Learning Framework with the Common Core Standards for Kindergarten in order to cultivate a shared understanding of what children should know. This also encourages consistent approaches and allows practitioners to draw from best practices in both early learning and K-3 education.

The workgroup also reviewed the newly revised Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework (2015). Since Oregon had already adopted the Head Start Framework as early learning standards for children ages three to five, the workgroup decided to base the alignment on the revised Framework. A high value is placed on the development and integration of standards and content for English Learners. Through an opportunity to participate in the BUILD Dual Language Learning (DLL) Table, we were able to solicit specific feedback on the alignment draft as well as recommendations for resources that can be used in writing/developing the recommended guiding principles and other content within the documents, and in our future work on supporting resources. The standards alignment workgroup has used the equity lens as a guide throughout the drafting process. As a result, intensive efforts have been made to assure that the narrative and the standards reflect the needs of DLLs. The group has also called for the simultaneous release of the document in English and the most common languages spoken by children and families in Oregon, which are English, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Russian. The draft continues to be reviewed for cultural responsiveness and inclusivity, considering the strengths and needs of populations of color, children with disabilities, and families in poverty.

#### Health Promotion

Health and Early Learning systems continue to work collectively in support of the shared goal of kindergarten readiness. Highlights include: the delivery of culturally responsive workforce development trainings on the implementation of developmental screening in early childhood settings; development and delivery of webinars on topics relevant to developmental screening; foundational work toward development of a culturally responsive social emotional development training; leveraging of other funds to support and sustain this work; cross-systems coordination/ health information exchange through an approach that enables results of the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) to be shared between early learning and health system providers; and an equity focus that has been woven into each element of the process and outcomes.

### **Developing and Supporting a Professional Early Childhood Education Workforce**



Oregon has a robust professional development system with a Career Lattice that connects with state licensing data and tracks ongoing training requirements and degree attainment. In 2015, Oregon continued to refine the revised Workforce Knowledge and Competencies (WKC). WKC was reviewed by 11 focus groups and was on the web for public comment and feedback for four months. All feedback has been summarized and the document is in final draft. The next step will be to work with a designer to create a user friendly format and then to publish. Highlights of the findings include a desire to keep the core knowledge categories (CKC) of Special Needs and Diversity as stand-alone categories. The focus groups articulated a desire to thread these themes throughout the other CKC's, so topics of diversity and special needs could be represented throughout Oregon's Core Body of Knowledge (CBK).

A major accomplishment made possible through RTT-ELC funding is the development of strong relationships with community colleges and the alignment of community college courses with CBK standards. We continue to have 12 of the 13 targeted community colleges that align their coursework with the CBK standards. As we wrap up RTT-ELC, the goal is to increase this to 13, following the release of the CBK summary document. Oregon continues to exceed targets for the number of early childhood educators that receive credentials from postsecondary institutions that are aligned to the CBK.

A common progression of credentials and degree work continued at Oregon's Annual Grand Articulation Summit in the spring of 2015. Approximately 70 participants attended, including community college staff, RTT students, and early learning professionals from partner agencies (e.g., Child Care Resource and Referral programs). This work epitomizes the importance of RTT-ELC funding in helping us create a sustainable system of supports for our early childhood workforce. We are currently working with our state Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program leads to build from this work and develop a plan for creating an integrated early childhood professional development system for home visitors.

## **Measuring Outcomes and Progress**

### **Kindergarten Assessment**

Oregon completed the third statewide administration of the kindergarten assessment in 2015. Across the board, students' performance increased in early math and early literacy domains. Students showing the most positive movement are African American, Latino and Native American. While positive trends have been observed, the data show that significant disparities exist by the time children enter kindergarten, highlighting the need for improved access to high quality, developmentally appropriate and culturally responsive early learning experiences.

A Kindergarten Assessment Advisory Panel was convened and was charged with providing recommendations on improving the implementation and administration of Oregon's Kindergarten Assessment; identifying future test items; and ensuring that test administration and measures are culturally responsive in order to help eliminate opportunity gaps in communities of color and among students who are emerging bilinguals. A cross-agency Kindergarten Assessment work plan, developed in 2015, identifies four primary focus areas: communications, data analysis and interpretation, training and technical assistance, and continuous improvement. This final category places emphasis on strengthening the assessment components and measurement tools. Oregon is committed to a performance-based early learning system in which shared outcomes drive positive change for children and families, and where data is used to increase the efficacy of the system. The Early

Learning Council (ELC) is also statutorily tasked with establishing performance metrics for the Early Learning Hubs. To accomplish this, the ELC created an ad hoc Hub Metric Workgroup in July, 2014 to assist in establishing initial metrics to which Hubs will be accountable. This workgroup completed its charge in 2015. The ELC, saw the need for a continued focus and subsequently created a standing Measuring Success Committee to provide ongoing monitoring and support in the use of performance metrics by the Hubs and to measure and monitor the success of the early learning system. The Committee has been charged to advise the Early Learning Council on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to measuring the success of the early learning system and ensuring equitable outcomes for all children.

### ***CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES***

While we have made progress towards our systems goals, we have also encountered challenges. For example, the complexity of maintaining cross-agency/cross-system relationships and focus on shared goals and outcomes, while our partner agencies are also adjusting to significant system-level reforms started in the last five years. The biggest opportunity as we approach the end of the RTT-ELC grant is to truly hold each system accountable to a shared set of outcome metrics, work Oregon is now prepared to do thanks to the groundwork laid through the initiatives funded through this grant. We are fortunate to work with partners who are invested in creating a strong system of support for our children and families.

Additionally, as our work to implement the TQRIS moves to the next stage of maturity we are challenged - but excited - to address the pressures of building a system of quality that reaches our children furthest from opportunity, including children of color, children experiencing poverty, children experiencing developmental delays and/ or disabilities, and children living in rural communities where access to formal early learning and development programs is limited. This means offering trainings, tools and resources to internal staff as well as external system partners to elevate understanding and awareness in ways that improve how we connect children and families to quality early learning programs. In support of this, we are actively working to strengthen our professional development system with increased availability of trainings as well as the availability of materials in multiple languages.

Given the projections for demographic changes in Oregon, highlighting and focusing on equity is a key strategy for ensuring that our early learning system is prepared to effectively serve the growing number of racially and ethnically diverse populations. As such, we continue to challenge our system, including ELD employees and funded programs and providers, to actively infuse equity into every aspect of our work, in order to meet the complex needs of children historically left behind by our early learning systems. This involves training and providing tools and resources to both internal staff and external system partners. We have begun to set clear expectations for funded providers to ensure that they are working towards making meaningful improvements in hiring culturally relevant staff and utilizing tools and instruments that are supported by evidence as effective among culturally diverse populations. This work will help the state address the opportunity gaps that are impacting many children in the state. It will also create a reflective early learning system focused on serving all children by ensuring that our historically underserved populations are supported and valued within the early learning system.

Finally, sustaining this work is another challenge we have confronted. Oregon's RTT-ELC

grant has enabled the Early Learning Division to strengthening the quality of early learning experiences offered by early care and education programs. It has also allowed us to build and implement Oregon's TQRIS. In addition to funding the design and implementation of TQRIS, RTT-ELC has enabled us to fund direct supports and coaching for programs striving to make needed program improvements to meet TQRIS standards. The expiration of RTT funding coincides with the implementation date for new Child Care and Development Fund requirements that will require additional annual on-site monitoring for over 3,000 license-exempt facilities. As a result, we have created a Support and Monitoring workgroup charged with developing and implementing a sustainability plan.

In closing, RTT-ELC has been instrumental in launching a new phase of systems change and strategic activities aimed at not only expanding our reach but improving the quality and availability of culturally responsive resources that support all of Oregon's children and families to learn and thrive. The foundational work launched by RTT-ELC has set us on the trajectory towards success at meeting the state's 40-40-20 goal as well as early learning system goals of ensuring that children arrive at kindergarten ready to learn, families are healthy, stable and attached, and that the early learning system is coordinated, aligned and family centered.

## Successful State Systems

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

#### Governance Structure

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

The Early Learning Council (ELC) was created in 2012 as the single body charged with guiding early learning and development programs in Oregon. In 2013, the Early Learning Division was established within the Oregon Department of Education, reorganizing early learning child care, preschool, and home visiting programs under one agency. The ELC is the rulemaking body for programs for which the Early Learning Division has statutory authority. In 2015, Governor Kate Brown appointed Megan Irwin as the Early Learning System Director, supporting the momentum for system development under Ms. Irwin's leadership as acting director in 2014.

In 2013 Oregon launched a system of community-based and community-owned coordinators of early learning services called Early Learning Hubs, who are responsible for bringing together partners from early childhood, K-12 education, health, human services, and the business sectors around a common vision and shared measurable outcomes for children and families. As of June 2015, there are sixteen Hubs covering all regions of the state. Hub regional boundaries are defined by and comprised of one to five counties.

The Hubs are directed by statute to accomplish three specific goals that align with the mission of the early learning system: (1) create an early childhood system that is aligned, coordinated and family-centered; (2) ensure that children arrive at school ready to succeed; and (3) ensure that Oregon's young children live in families that are healthy, stable and attached.

While communities have the flexibility to design their own operational model and set of strategies - acknowledging that a "one size fits all" approach to transformation doesn't work - each Hub shares the following responsibilities:

- Identify children at risk of arriving at kindergarten unprepared for school;
- Provide supports to ensure that services and programs are creating an equitable and inclusive environment for children, their families and their communities;
- Work with families to identify specific needs;
- Connect families to the supports or services that most meet their needs;
- Work across traditional silos; and
- Account for outcomes collectively and cost effectively.

The ELC is committed to a performance-based early learning system in which shared outcomes drive positive change for children and families, and where data is used to increase the efficacy of the system. The ELC is also statutorily tasked with establishing performance metrics for the Early Learning Hubs. The ELC established an ad hoc Hub Metric Workgroup in July, 2014, which completed its charge in 2015. The ELC created a standing Measuring Success Committee to provide on-going monitoring and support in the use of performance metrics by the Hubs, and to measure and monitor the success of the early learning system. The Committee has been charged to advise the Early Learning Council on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to measuring the

success of the early learning system and ensuring equitable outcomes for all children.

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

- The Early Learning Council and Oregon Health Policy Board have teamed to create a joint subcommittee to ensure all children in Oregon are healthy and ready to be successful in Kindergarten. By integrating health care and early learning policies, sharing resources, and aligning goals, the joint subcommittee is helping children in Oregon get the health care and the education they need to flourish.
- The Early Learning Council's Equity Subcommittee created a report outlining recommendations to operationalize the Equity Lens within Oregon's early learning policy, programs, and systems transformation. The report includes recommendations and tools in three categories: culturally responsive practice, early learning operating systems, and data and resource allocation.
- The Child Care and Education Committee is chartered to advise the Early Learning Council (ELC) on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to affordable, quality child care and early education programs in Oregon, to provide outreach and act as a liaison between citizens and the ELC through community forums and surveys to engage parents, early care and education providers and union representatives and to prioritize outcome based policies for child care and early education issues related to quality, affordability and system coordination. The child care and education committee is also responsible for providing input on rules before they are approved by the council.
- The Early Learning Council's Best Beginnings Committee, which also serves as the Healthy Families Oregon Advisory Committee advises the Early Learning Council on the issues, challenges, successes and priorities related to serving at-risk families who are pregnant and/or have children aged three years old or under. The Committee's areas of responsibility include defining a set of core prenatal through age three priorities in accordance with the strategies and tactics adopted in the 2015 - 2020 strategic plan developed by the Early Learning Council.
- The Early Learning Division continues to build upon a solid relationship with the Oregon Health Authority's Transformation Center, a key partner in developmental screening efforts. We are deepening Oregon's commitment to bridge health and early learning to support our ambitious education goals.

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

Describe State progress in involving representatives from Participating Programs, Early Childhood Educators or their representatives, parents and families, including parents and families of Children with High Needs, and other key stakeholders in the implementation of the activities carried out under the grant.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement**

Describe State progress in involving representatives from Participating Programs, Early Childhood Educators or their representatives, parents and families, including parents and families of Children with High Needs, and other key stakeholders in the implementation of the activities carried out under the grant.

-----

Stakeholder engagement is a value of the early learning system and is critical to ensuring that the system we are building reflects and responds to the diverse need of Oregonians. It informs the work we do to support Oregon children and families and as a result, has made for more well-rounded policy decisions. In 2015, "Principles of Community Engagement" were developed to ensure all decisions made are inclusive of the myriad stakeholders impacted by our work.



The principles include:

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

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

**COLLABORATION AND SHARED PURPOSE** - We support and encourage all residents of Oregon to work together in service of children, families and communities through community engagement.

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

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

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

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

We have also created a Community Engagement Model and Worksheet to ensure that community engagement strategies are applied consistently across the division. We launched the community engagement model with Preschool Promise.

Several examples of how we engage stakeholders and the public are described below.

#### Preschool Promise

Preschool Promise - the new mixed delivery preschool program to support children and families at 200% of federal poverty level - was modeled after a Race to the Top- Preschool Development Grant that the Early Learning Division (ELD) applied for in 2014. While the initial proposal was not funded, having a well-defined plan enabled us to successfully request funding during the 2015 legislative session. Preschool Promise will launch in Fall 2016. ELD began planning for the development of the program with the rollout of a large scale stakeholder engagement process.

Over 300 stakeholders were engaged in 25 public meetings to help inform what Preschool Promise should deliver for children. Stakeholders included: community based organizations, tribal communities, K-12 educators and administrators, child care providers, early learning hubs, Oregon Pre-K programs, and families. The topics included: the role of the early learning hubs, culturally responsive teaching, parent engagement and enrollment, wrap around services, bachelor's degree requirement, professional support needs,

and approaches to continuous improvement.

Input was analyzed and integrated into Preschool Promise's rule making content. Feedback was bidirectional: a matrix was created with the topline results shared with community members that attended the feedback sessions.

### Website

A new website is currently under development, merging the current Office of Child Care and ELD websites to maximize our ability to reach providers, parents and the community at large that are invested in the development of children. The new website will:

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

The projected end date for website development is December 2016.

### Tiered Quality Rating Improvement System Marketing

The Early Learning Division is currently in the process of selecting a vendor to develop messaging, branding and marketing for Oregon's TQRIS. The request for proposal was made public on January 14, 2016, and a vendor is expected to be in place and work plan started by March 1, 2016.

### Vroom

Vroom is a national early learning initiative that provides parents and caregivers of young children with science-based activities to turn everyday moments into brain-building opportunities. In 2015, Oregon began partnering with the Bezos Family Foundation --the creators of Vroom --to introduce the initiative in the state. Oregon is the first and only state to roll out Vroom statewide.

Vroom and its benefits are promoted to parents across Oregon in a number of ways. First and foremost, grants have been provided to 25 pilot sites to roll out Vroom in their respective communities. Pilot sites include Early Learning Hubs, Head Start Programs, Tribal groups, and other government and community organizations. The ELD is also currently exploring pilot site partnership opportunities with various immigrant and minority advocacy groups. ELD has coordinated and lead efforts to translate Vroom materials in Spanish, Russian, Chinese, and Vietnamese to ensure

We are working closely with pilot sites to ensure they have the support needed to be successful, including Vroom materials, trainings on how to discuss the science behind Vroom's brain building activities with diverse audiences, and strategic coordination to ensure these groups are reaching parents and caregivers where they live. In accordance to ELD's focus on equity and equitable access for children and their families, we are currently translating the most popular Vroom materials into Russian, Vietnamese, and traditional Chinese. These materials will be made available to the Vroom pilot sites by March of 2016.

In addition, the ELD continues to work with partners in early childhood development to make sure that Vroom is in the hands of state employees working directly with families. This includes outreach through groups like the Oregon Health Authority, Community Care Organizations, Department of Human Services, and library districts.

### **Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders**

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had or will have an impact on the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact and any anticipated changes to the RTT-ELC State Plan as a result.

#### **Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders**

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had or will have an impact on the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact and any anticipated changes to the RTT-ELC State Plan as a result.

2015 was an exciting year for early learning in Oregon; the Legislature made over \$100 million in new investments in early childhood care and education, passed legislation creating a new mixed-delivery preschool program, *Preschool Promise*, and strengthened Oregon's child care subsidy program for working families experiencing poverty. In addition, the Early Learning Hub system received new state investments to support their work in building the capacity of their communities to better meet the needs of young children and their families. The Legislature also invested in Kindergarten Partnership and Innovation, Healthy Families Oregon (home visiting), Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education, and Relief Nurseries.

The Legislature passed HB 2015, a significant reform of Employment Related Day Care (ERDC), Oregon's child care subsidy program for working families with incomes up to 185% of FPL. This legislation will enable ERDC to better support families experiencing poverty to participate in the workforce; promote positive child development; increase the number of children in quality care by linking to Oregon's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS); and better ensure the health and safety of children. The Legislature invested \$45 million in ERDC to support these policy changes.

The Legislature also invested \$2.3 million to support Focused Child Care Networks to ensure that child care providers serving communities experiencing poverty and culturally and linguistically diverse communities have access to Oregon's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.

Finally, the Legislature authorized the creation of a new mixed-delivery preschool program, called *Preschool Promise*. "Mixed-delivery" means that child care providers, Oregon Head Start Pre-Kindergarten programs, school-based preschool programs, and Community-based organizations will all be

eligible to provide preschool services through this program, as long as they obtain a 4- or 5-star TQRIS rating and meet other standards. Three- and four-year old children whose families' income is up to 200% of the Federal Poverty Line will be eligible to participate in this preschool program. Early Learning Hubs will play two important roles in Preschool Promise, with funding flowing through the Hubs. First, the Hubs will identify the needs of populations poorly served by the current early learning system. Second, they will partner with early learning programs within their community to provide the preschool services. The Legislature allocated about \$17.5 million enabling roughly 1,200 children to have access to preschool starting in fall 2016.

The Oregon Legislature acknowledged the vital role Early Learning Hubs play in Oregon's early learning system, enacting SB 213, which removed "demonstration project" from the statutory language governing the Hubs and gave the Hubs permanent statutory status. The Legislature increased direct funding to the Hubs by \$10.5 million for the biennium, for a total of \$15 million. This investment continues to strengthen Oregon's local infrastructure to accomplish the RTT-ELC goals and targets. SB 213 also directed the Council to adopt accountability metrics which were established in January, 2015.

The Legislature funded the Kindergarten Partnership and Innovation program at \$9.1 million for the 2015-17 biennium- an increase of \$5 million. Funding was also increased for the Healthy Families Oregon (HFO) home visiting program by \$9.5 million and Relief Nurseries received an additional \$1.2 million in funding, bringing their total state funding to \$10.6 million. These state investments are considered a true win for the early learning system. This new funding will help both Healthy Families Oregon and Relief Nurseries serve more families with evidence-based practices. Last biennium there were over 1,100 families who were screened, eligible, and interested in participating but were unable to because of lack of funding. The increase in funds will allow Oregon to establish additional satellite Relief Nurseries, ultimately allowing more children and families to be served. These investments are a testament of the impact of the systems development work initiated with RTT-ELC funding.

The Early Learning Council is considering proposals for further legislative investments and/or program enhancements in early learning workforce professional development, preschool to grade-3 alignment, and home visiting in the 2017-19 biennium. Decisions on these potential proposals will be made by the Early Learning Council in the spring of 2016 and if advanced, will be considered by the Governor's office for submission to the 2017 Legislature.

### **Participating State Agencies**

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

There are no changes in participation or commitment by the Participating State Agencies in the State Plan. The Lead Agency for the RTT-ELC continues to be the Early Learning Division of the Oregon Department of Education. The State Advisory Council continues to be the Early Learning Council. The Early Learning Division functions under the direction of the Early Learning Council with the Early Learning System Director as the administrative officer.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES



## High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

During this reporting year of RTT-ELC implementation, has the State made progress in **developing or revising** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards?

**If yes**, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- State-funded preschool programs
- Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
  - Center-based
  - Family Child Care

**If yes**, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- Early Learning and Development Standards
- A Comprehensive Assessment System
- Early Childhood Educator Qualifications
- Family Engagement Strategies
- Health Promotion Practices
- Effective Data Practices

**The State has made progress in ensuring that** (please check all that apply):

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

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

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

In 2015, numerous efforts were made to improve the quality of TQRIS, including the following:

- Translation and distribution of TQRIS materials in Spanish and Russian. The first Spanish portfolios were star rated and ten Spanish portfolios were received and reviewed. Two of those portfolios successfully received a 3-star rating. Twenty-seven portfolios in Russian were mailed out in 2015. At this time, we have not received any portfolios in Russian to review and rate.
- Development of a timeline and work plan for TQRIS revision , for implementation in 2016. The first two quarters will focus on community engagement while the second two quarters will hone in on revisions based upon data, feedback, and other state priorities.
- Completion of data collection for the Validation Study One and initial analysis. Initial evidence suggests that higher (3-5 star) versus lower (1-2 star) TQRIS ratings differentiate the quality of observed teacher-child interactions using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). The strongest evidence has so far been detected for the Instructional Support domain of the CLASS, and for PreK-aged settings. Findings are fairly consistent across center-based and home-based providers.
- The addition of health partners to the TQRIS implementation team will strengthen the promotion of health practices in the TQRIS.

Key strategies for the last year of the grant include the following TQRIS revisions:

- a. Community engagement with providers and stakeholders regarding meaningful revisions will occur. Trends from initial engagement sessions will be collected and specific audiences, including communities of color and rural providers and partners, will be engaged in solution sessions around the trends.
- b. Analysis of validation study findings and impact on the standards to determine which standards represent the “few and the powerful” to the differentiation of the tiers
- c. Equity work regarding cultural relevance and access to the TQRIS including community engagement with diverse cultural and language communities.
- d. Updates of the mission, vision, and guiding principles of the TQRIS toward the revisions are planned in 2016. The vision of the TQRIS is that all of Oregon's children will have access to quality care and education that promotes each child's development, school readiness, and continued success in academics and life. Key principles for the revision process include transparency, focusing on equity, and to be data driven. The mission, vision, and guiding principles will be translated into Oregon's key five languages (Chinese, Vietnamese, Spanish, English, and Russian).

The revision work will be completed in 2016.

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

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

In 2014, Oregon expanded its TQRIS field test statewide making revisions based on input and feedback from 2013. It is important to note that while the field test was underway in eight of the 36 counties in Oregon, there was a substantial amount of work being done to have statewide perspective and prepare Early Learning and Development Programs (ELDP) for 2014.

Oregon became much more intentional in recruiting ELDPs and was able to target recruitment based on readiness indicators associated with the TQRIS standards in the second year of the grant.

During 2015, Oregon participation focused on children furthest from opportunity. Programs serving those children were targeted through increased availability and distribution of revised materials for providers speaking Russian and Spanish, the provision of submission bonuses for Spanish and Russian portfolios, and the creation of specific support cohorts for diverse language Quality Improvement Specialists and staff in order to better serve diverse language providers. We also targeted training and recruitment of programs serving children of color, children in poverty, rural communities and expanded focused family child care networks. Focused networks are an evidence-based approach of quality improvement by supporting cohorts of providers serving children from targeted communities. In Oregon, Early Learning Hubs identified the communities of children to be targeted and recruited providers accordingly.

We also worked specifically with Head Start programs, including specific staff supporting licensing and TQRIS ratings as well as with programs serving children on subsidy contracted slots.

Additional highlights include:

1. Incorporating equity and diversity components to performance based contracts.
2. Continuing support, resources, and scholarships for professional development of practitioners (see Supporting Early Childhood Educators section)
3. The movement of 17 Programs of Quality, to a designation of 3-, 4-, or 5-star rated programs. Six of these programs serve children in contracted slots, a subsidy program for full time working parents
4. Continuing to waive the Oregon Registry Step application fee to encourage providers to obtain a professional development step.

Key strategies for the last year of the grant include:

1. Further alignment with Early Learning Hubs for participation and TQRIS goals. For example, the performance metrics for Hubs includes specific targets for TQRIS.
2. Targeted work with "Commitment to Quality Programs" that have intentionally engaged in quality improvements but not been rated yet.
3. Targeted consumer education on TQRIS. We are in the process of identifying a vendor to assist with efforts to market and promote TQRIS.

4. Continued conversations with tribal governments to identify, address and remove barriers to their participation in TQRIS.

**Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)**

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

<b>Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	70	27%	96	40%	193	80%	241	100%	241	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	72	30%	93	40%	186	80%	232	100%	232	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	4	12%	5	14%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	3	75%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,159	29%	2,490	33%	3,168	42%	3,470	46%	3,772	50%
Other 1	4,468	100%	4,493	100%	4,462	100%	4,462	100%	4,462	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	State Licensed									
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.										



**Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows**

**Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

**Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	263	70	27%	241	96	40%	231	141	66%	31	21	68%			
<i>Specify:</i>	Include sites that operate Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten and Early Head Start programs.														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	243	72	30%	232	98	42%	258	142	55%	276	192	70%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%	35	0	0%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	4	0	0%	9	0	0%	10	0	0%	9	0	0%			
Programs receiving CCDF funds	7,544	2,159	29%	6,910	2,254	33%	6,879	3,259	47.3%	7,004	2,159	31%			
Other 1	4,468	4,468	100%	4,367	4,367	100%	4,286	4,286	100%	4,263	4,263	100%			
<i>Describe:</i>	State Licensed														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

**Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows**

**Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
Other 4															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

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

State-funded preschool (Oregon Pre-Kindergarten) and Early Head Start(EHS) & Head Start(HS): Methodology for state preschool and HS/EHS # and % participation: HS/EHS # sites calculated using Center Report in Head Start Enterprise System; state-funded preschool number of sites from Site & Service Workbooks submitted to state. Participation in TQRIS calculated from state-generated list of licensed Head Start/OPK sites (December 2015) and from WOU-TRI monthly TQRIS status report (January 2016).

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

Programs funded by IDEA, Part C: Data source is Annual Progress Report, ODE, 2015. Early intervention services are provided to families in their home.

Programs funded by Title I, ESEA: Data source is the Consolidated State Performance Report, 2013-14.

CCDF: 801 ACF data, October 2014- September 2015. For year two, there was a significant increase in the percentage of licensed programs receiving CCDF funds. For year three, this percentage mirrors more closely year one. It is our understanding that year two's percentage actually reflects the percentage of children not programs in licensed settings receiving CCDF funding. In year three, this percentage is accurate, reflecting the percentage of programs.

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

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

The target set for Head Start and state funded preschool sites was 100%. Some sites have experienced challenges completing and/or maintaining the licensing requirements (first tier in TQRIS) including local zoning requirements, coordinating and aligning staff position titles/ roles between Head Start and Office of Child Care regulations, temporary nature of some sites located in school districts and other donated or leased facilities, and issues related to operating multi-site programs that are not adequately addressed in current child care regulations. In response to this, the state is working closely with Head Start, state funded preschool programs, and child care to clarify challenges and develop and implement solutions.

These numbers were re-calculated this year to better match listed categories (state-funded preschool vs. Head Start/Early Head Start). Previously, program sites that received both federal Head Start/Early Head Start funding and also state funding for the Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten program were split across these two categories based on percent of state and federal funding each program received. Since programs that receive federal funding participate differently in the state's TQRIS program than do our state-only programs (federally funded programs can utilize a streamlined system, while state-funded only programs must complete all elements in the TQRIS process), it seemed more appropriate to separate these sites in the current report. Additionally, several programs consolidated sites this year, moving several single classroom sites into larger multi-room buildings, which resulted in lower numbers.

Oregon has seen an increase in percentage of license exempt programs serving children on subsidy this year. However in 2016, Oregon will be implementing tiered reimbursement based upon TQRIS star level. This is a specific strategy to incentivize licensed, star rated programs to serve children on subsidy and for families to choose such programs. In addition, with the CCDF reauthorization, it is anticipated that many license exempt providers will choose to become licensed as the requirements for each will look so similar.

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

The State has made progress in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that (please check all that apply):

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

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

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

In 2015, progress was made in the rating and monitoring system of the TQRIS through:

1. Inter-rater reliability of portfolio reviewers re-establishment in 2015. The process evaluation team at The Research Institute, the university based agency that administers Oregon's TQRIS, conducted a second inter-rater reliability test for portfolio reviewers to establish that reviewers are still evaluating reviewers the same way. The results were that inter-rater reliability is 89%;
2. Additional CLASS observers were trained on the Infant CLASS;
3. The review process was streamlined providing clearer and more rapid feedback to programs;
4. A streamlined resubmission process was implemented to encourage programs to increase their star rating after an initial rating;
5. Input from focus groups of providers on the annual report process;
6. A cross-sector Support and Monitoring Breakthrough team created a work plan to integrate licensing monitoring and TQRIS monitoring;
7. Creation of automated notifications to streamline licensing compliance and TQRIS compliance. Program quality staff at the Early Learning Division are emailed automatically when licensing violations occur for TQRIS engaged programs. This is an efficient monitoring tool to be sure that programs are meeting the compliance standard of the TQRIS;

Key strategies for the last year of the grant include plans to implement an electronic system for rating and monitoring; aligning an annual report with data points and electronic systems; implementing plans for an integrated system of monitoring for licensing and TQRIS;



implementing a random audit system for programs; and creating a policy that protects against fraudulent submissions.

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

Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices? (If yes, please check all that apply.)

- Program and provider training
- Program and provider technical assistance
- Financial rewards or incentives
- Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates
- Increased compensation

Describe the progress made in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Oregon has continued its commitment to continuous quality improvement of its ELDPs and the practitioners that serve Oregon's children.

In 2015, Oregon maintained its commitment to create a system that provides high quality practitioner training, including its master trainer program and local, regional, and statewide training opportunities. Oregon also piloted a virtual training model with a trainer in one location and a facilitator and participants in a second location as a strategy for reaching language specific and rural providers.

Technical assistance providers continued to receive training and support through the central coordination model in order to provide quality improvement TA to programs. The TA providers were trained and guided to target programs serving children furthest from opportunity and adjust their TA models accordingly.

Oregon upheld its commitment to program and practitioner level financial supports and incentives. Practitioners were able to receive education awards for meeting professional development milestones as well as a second education award if their program was star rated. Programs continued to receive quality improvement support money as well as quality maintenance incentive money once they were rated. Programs in focused family child care networks and programs serving special populations received enhanced support money (double the standard rate). Programs submitting portfolios in Russian or Spanish were eligible for submission bonuses in 2015.

In 2015, the Oregon Legislature approved a system of bonuses to star rated programs, known as tiered reimbursement. Policies and communications began in 2015 with implementation in early 2016. The same legislation authorized reduced copays for parents receiving child care subsidies who voluntarily choose a star-rated provider. The reduced copays will be implemented in the summer of 2016. Additionally, higher compensation was offered via contracted slots to programs serving eligible children on subsidy. The highest subsidy reimbursement rate was paid to these programs for these slots, regardless of charge or age. We have improved access to and quality of programs serving children with high needs because of Oregon's dedication to equity and the implementation of key strategies in 2015.

Oregon has created an effective resubmission process, so that programs not achieving their desired star level are provided with specific and targeted technical assistance and feedback around the specific components of their program that need to be improved to meet that star

rating. With this streamlined process, Oregon has seen significant increases in star levels of participation programs (3-star +32%, 4-star +97%, 5-star +69% with an overall 53% increase for star-rated programs). For example, 60 program portfolios initially rated at a Commitment to Quality level (level 2) achieved a star level after resubmission. Thirty-one program portfolios that were initially star rated *increased* their star level after resubmission (Data from The Research Institute, 2015).

Because of Oregon's commitment and laser focus on equity in 2015, many of the participation strategies described in previous sections are relevant to the improvement of programs and access of high quality programs for children with high needs. Note that the strategies target programs serving children with high needs.

With the provision and distribution of revised Spanish and Russian materials for providers speaking Russian and Spanish, ten Spanish portfolios were received and rated including two rated at 3-star. The submission bonus for Spanish and Russian portfolios continues through March, 2016. Twenty-seven portfolios in Russian were mailed out in 2015. At this time, we have not received any portfolios in Russian to review and date.

Partners in the system have been trained and instructed to recruit programs serving children of color, children in poverty, rural communities which have been reflected in the implementation of additional focused family child care networks (cohorts of providers serving children from these targeted communities). Accountability for this work continues through 2016 through the operationalization of the equity preamble in all performance based contracts.

Key strategies for the last year of the grant include:

1. Intentional community engagements with communities historically underserved by our early learning system to inform revisions to the TQRIS to help ensure cultural relevancy and access to the TQRIS.
2. Specific community engagement with providers who have chosen NOT to intentionally engage in TQRIS to identify the challenges and inform the TQRIS revision.
3. Enhance the alignment with Early Learning Hubs to align data and targeted work with specific communities to align and achieve access and participation goals. The goals include an increased supply of quality programs as well as increased access (enrollment) of identified populations of children in quality programs.
4. Leverage tiered reimbursement to provide access to children on subsidy. With the tiered reimbursement policy, programs are being incentivized financially to serve children on subsidy by receiving higher payment rates from DHS. This supply-side incentive is designed to increase the number of programs improving quality/becoming star rated. In addition, the tiered reimbursement policy includes a "demand side" component where parents will be receiving reduced copayments for accessing star rated programs.

**Performance Measures (B)(4)(c)(1)**

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

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

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

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

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

2015 data is extracted from The Research Institutes' TQRIS data. Total number from Tier One (Licensed programs) is from Early Learning Division CCRIS facility data for 2015.

**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Target Notes**

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

For year three targets, the overall intentional participation in TQRIS has increased from 23% of all licensed programs to 28% of all licensed programs. Oregon has well surpassed its level two goals (861 actual vs. 90 target). Oregon has also surpassed its targets for 3-star programs. The 4- and 5-star levels, while almost doubling in year three, continue to reflect the slower than expected rating of Head Start programs due to system integration around licensing and the professional development registry. In addition, Oregon has experienced across two of three licensing settings that 4-star seems to be the least populated tier. The system continues to invest in supporting the Head Starts to become licensed including specific technical assistance, system wide meetings and solution sessions.

**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Definition of Highest Tiers**

For purposes of Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2), how is the State defining its "highest tiers"?

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

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	0	0%	2,943	40%	5,886	80%	7,358	100%	7,358	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	0	0%	4,006	40%	9,434	80%	11,793	100%	11,793	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	0	0%	30	0.4%	40	0.5%	50	0.7%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	160	25%	320	50%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	0	0%	579	4%	1,034	8%	1,754	12%	1,876	12%
Other 1										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.



**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows**

**Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

In most States, the **Number of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State** for the current reporting year will correspond to the **Total** reported in Table (A)(1)-3a. If not, please explain the reason in the data notes.

**Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	7,358	0	0%	7,358	0	0%	7,840	637	8%	7,922	1,801	22.7%			
<i>Specify:</i>	Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten and state-funded Early Head Start programs.														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	10,014	0	0%	11,793	0	0%	11,143	996	9%	9,463	2,702	28.6%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	2,989	0	0%	2,989	0	0%	3,302	0	0%	4,027	0	0%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	7,261	0	0%	7,261	13	0.2%	7,339	306	4.2%	6,783	694	9.8%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	638	0	0%	638	0	0%	0	0	0%	415	0	0%			
Programs receiving CCDF funds	15,238	0	0%	15,238	48	0.32%	20,599	450	2.1%	26,909	1,702	6%			
Other 1															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

**Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows**

**Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS**

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four				
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	
Other 3																
<i>Describe:</i>																
Other 4																
<i>Describe:</i>																
Other 5																
<i>Describe:</i>																
Other 6																
<i>Describe:</i>																
Other 7																
<i>Describe:</i>																
Other 8																
<i>Describe:</i>																
Other 9																
<i>Describe:</i>																
Other 10																
<i>Describe:</i>																

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

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

State-funded preschool, Early Head Start and Head Start: number of children in state preschool and Head Start/Early Head Start (including Migrant/Seasonal and Tribal Head Start) from Head Start Enterprise System 2014 Program Information Report (PIR) data.

Services for children under IDEA. Part C (early intervention) are provided to families in their homes.

Data Source for IDEA, Part C: Annual Special Education Child Count, 2014-15

Data Source for IDEA, Part C: Annual Special Education Child Count, 2014-15

Data Source for Title I of ESEA: Consolidated State Performance Report  
2013-14

CCDF: ACF 801 Data, October 2014 - September 2015.

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

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

Head Start and state-funded preschool sites experienced challenges becoming licensed (first tier in state's TQRIS) or in reaching top tiers in TQRIS, primarily due to the current method used to calculate personnel qualifications in the TQRIS. For example, child care licensing rules are currently designed for full day child care programs, and most Head Start and state preschool programs are part day programs that were previously exempt from licensing rules. Since the state's TQRIS sets licensing as the first tier of the rating system, Head Start programs are now required to become licensed, but the rules have not been revised to better fit part day preschool programs. Licensing staff do not have much experience licensing part day programs, and sometimes try to apply non-applicable rules, such as those governing rest periods, to Head Start sites. Licensing position titles and roles, such as "Director," "Teacher" and "Aide" do not align with Head Start position titles and roles. Since staff qualifications (degrees and training) of these positions are a primary determinant of a program's rating in the TQRIS, misalignment of these position titles has caused several Head Start programs to be rated lower than expected in TQRIS. Likewise, the current TQRIS, may not adequately acknowledge additional classroom staff who contribute to improved staff to child ratios, which most would consider a sign of higher quality. Subsequently, most Head Start programs that have maintained a third person (Aides) in the classroom have not been able to achieve a star-rating under the current TQRIS.

The state is working with Head Start, state funded preschools and child care to identify and implement solutions to this challenge.

For the final year of the grant, several specific strategies will be employed to assist Oregon in meeting its targets. First, we will be continue to work closely with Head Start programs to identify (through discussion and engagement) and address challenges in obtaining a TQRIS rating. This work is currently underway and will wrap up later in 2016. Preschool Specialists at the Early Learning Division continue to work with Head Start programs to navigate the current

licensing and TQRIS challenges to assist programs to become rated at the top tiers of TQRIS. Technical assistance will be provided to help program navigate the process. Second, the expansion of and continued work with focused family child care networks will support programs to become star rated. Finally, the implementation of tiered reimbursement will create a financial incentive for programs to become star rated and serve children on subsidy.

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

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

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

The goal of the process evaluation is to evaluate how well the TQRIS meets its objectives around program quality improvement. Findings include information concerning the type of technical assistance provided, which standards providers find most valuable and timeframes for programs to be rated and move up in their rating. The evaluation has demonstrated that the Learning and Development Standards are most meaningful to programs regarding quality improvements. The process evaluation has also documented the improving (decreasing) time frame for programs' portfolios to be reviewed and rated.

Validation study-1 examined the validity of rating levels against classroom quality as measured by the CLASS observation tool as a standard. The goal for the validation study is to determine whether the tiers differentiate quality. The validation team aimed to observe 300 programs, including 20 programs of each license type (certified family, registered family, and certified center) at each of the five tiers.

Data collection for Study-1 is complete. Observations were completed on 312 ELDP. The sample was distributed across the different star-rated programs as follows: 19% 5-star programs, 7% 4-star programs, 24% 3-star programs, 29% 2-star programs, and 19% comparison programs not intentionally engaging in the TQRIS, and who were identified as likely to be "low quality" based on administrative data for personnel qualifications. The programs were 49% centers, 30% certified family providers, and 21% registered family providers. Observations were conducted with the Toddler and PreK versions of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System, as well as a version that combined the Toddler and Pre- Kindergarten instruments for settings with mixed age groups. Observations were conducted in up to four classrooms per program. The Validation Study Team is actively conducting analyses of Study -1 data. Analyses to-date include descriptive statistics, correlations, ANOVAs, and multi-level models.

The study continues to be in the midst of trends that persist across Oregon's TQRIS including a smaller number of 4-star programs than other tiers, and a smaller number of registered family programs at the Four (4) and five (5) tiers compared to other program types. There have also been challenges in obtaining provider participation. Initial evidence suggests that higher (3-5 star) versus lower (1-2 tier) TQRIS ratings differentiate the quality of observed teacher/child interactions using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). The strongest evidence has so far been detected for the Instructional Support domain of the CLASS and for Pre-Kindergarten age settings. Findings are fairly consistent across center-

based and home-based providers.

Initial findings are being shared and the team is beginning to frame interpretation through the use of an ongoing review team comprised of representatives from the validation study, the child care unit, the TQRIS rating process, TQRIS technical assistance, the Oregon Professional Development Registry, and the Oregon Early Learning Division.

The Validation Team is also consulting with the broader implementation team for input on which data points to further analyze, such as standard and indicator level data. In addition, the Validation team has coordinated with technical assistance providers and licensing specialists in order to increase program participation.

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

Portland State University (PSU) is collecting data for Study-2. PSU has received contact information on 129 ELDP who submitted TQRIS portfolios and are thus potential participants in the Validation Study-2. Of these, contact has been made with 73 ELDP of whom 68 were eligible. The primary reason an ELDP is not eligible is that they only serve school age children. In total, 28 ELDP have not yet been contacted; 23 (34%) have declined; and 46 (68%) are eligible and have agreed to participate.

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

Key strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made for the last year of the grant include: continued alignment and communication with key partners to encourage provider participation; and engagement of “Commitment to Quality” programs who are “portfolio ready” to increase the pool of rated programs for the studies.



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

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

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

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

## Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

The State has made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards (check all that apply):

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

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

In the winter of 2015, a broad recruitment of stakeholders across the state was carried out to invite participation in the alignment of Oregon's Early Learning Framework - the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework - with the Common Core Standards for Kindergarten. Learning standards influence educational decisions regarding curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Having a shared understanding of what children should know encourages consistent approaches and allows practitioners to draw from best practices in both early learning and K -3 education.

The Standards Alignment workgroup was comprised of kindergarten teachers, child care providers, Head Start directors, early childhood and school-age special educators, representatives from non-profit organizations, university researchers, specialists from state departments, and others. They began meeting in March 2015. The workgroup was initially tasked with aligning the domains of language, literacy and mathematics. These domains were selected because they align with the domains of Oregon's end of Kindergarten common core state standards. Very early on, the group advocated that, in addition to language, literacy, and mathematics, the alignment needed to include kindergarten standards for social emotional development and approaches to learning. With this in mind, the work group has been engaged in writing new kindergarten standards and language for these two domains while focused on aligning existing language from the three original domains. A contractor from Education Northwest assisted with conducting monthly meetings, editing and formatting of the alignment document, and developing tools and supports.

The standards alignment work has resulted in the following:

- Clear alignment of developmental progressions and expectations for learning in Oregon's Early Learning Outcomes Framework and Oregon's Common Core Standards that address the domains of language, literacy, mathematics, social emotional development and approaches to learning, with explicit emphasis on language and literacy development across domain areas.
- A set of core knowledge and skill indicators for children transitioning to kindergarten.
- An aligned set of standards and guidance related to English learners, from age three to kindergarten.
- A set of tools and supports to assist early learning professionals and kindergarten teachers in the implementation of the aligned standards.

In June 2015, the workgroup reviewed the newly revised Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework (2015). Since Oregon had already adopted the Head Start Framework as early learning standards for children ages 3-5, the workgroup decided to base the alignment on the revised Framework.

The workgroup set a high value on development and integration of standards and content for English Learners. Through an opportunity with the BUILD Dual Language Learner (DLL) Learning Table, we were able to solicit specific feedback on the alignment draft as well as recommendations for resources that can be used in writing/developing the recommended Guiding Principles and other content within the documents, and in our future work on supporting resources.

The workgroup also set a high value on assuring that the standards are relevant for teachers, childcare providers, and parents. The draft alignment has been reviewed several times for alignment with Oregon's Equity lens. The lens is a tool that the Early Learning Council has adopted in order to focus and coordinate efforts around equitable practices and outcomes for children.

The standards alignment workgroup has used the equity lens as a guiding document throughout the drafting process. We've used the lens as a guide in three primary ways: prioritizing the learning and developmental needs of English learners, focusing on translating the document and publishing simultaneously with the English version, and reviewing the draft for cultural responsiveness. As a result, intensive efforts have taken place to assure that the narrative and the standards reflect the needs of Dual Language Learners. The group has also called for the simultaneous release of the document in English and the most common languages spoken by children and families in Oregon, which are English, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Russian. The draft continues to be reviewed for cultural responsiveness and inclusivity, considering the strengths and needs of populations of color, children with disabilities and families in poverty.

In 2015-16, the workgroup will focus on graphic design, resource and materials development, and translation into various languages (identified with the help of Early Learning Hubs and School Districts). The alignment is slated to be completed and released in early summer of 2016.

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

The State has made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to (check all that apply):

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

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

Not applicable.

OREGON DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA C(2) IN ITS RTT ELC APPLICATION

### Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

- Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety;
- Ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and
- Promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of your TQRIS Program Standards;
- Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported in meeting the health standards;
- Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity; and
- Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets.

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

Oregon continues to make major progress in all areas of health promotion in the grant. Highlights include (1) delivery of workforce development trainings on implementation of developmental screening in early childhood settings, (2) development and delivery of webinars on topics relevant to developmental screening, (3) foundational work toward development of a social emotional development training, (4) leveraging of other funds, (5) cross-systems coordination/health information exchange and (6) an equity focus woven into each element of the process and outcomes.

#### Workforce Trainings & Sustainability

The six-hour early childhood professional development training, "Implementing Developmental Screening Using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire," is now available across the state. This year we conducted three training-of-trainers (TOTs) in diverse regions of the state for a total of four TOTs to date. Oregon now has 94 Master Trainers (77) and Home Visiting Field Specialists (17) trained and equipped with the curriculum and all accompanying resources and tools to conduct training-of-providers for early childhood professionals throughout Oregon. Eighteen of the trainers are Spanish-speaking, three are Russian-speaking, one can train in Japanese, one in Chinese and Vietnamese and one in American Sign Language. The training has received approval through the Oregon Center for Career Development Professional Development Registry for official professional development credit.

The performance of trained trainers delivering the ASQ curriculum to early childhood professionals is evidence of the sustainability of promotion of developmental screening in early childhood settings beyond the RTT grant period. Master Trainers within the Registry are now delivering the standardized training on an ongoing basis. In the 2015 calendar year, this cadre of trainers has conducted 58 training-of-providers (TOPs) registered training in 25 of Oregon's 33 counties for a total of 719 participants. Twelve of those trainings were conducted in Spanish for a total of 129 participants. To further support sustainability, we have plans to organize a community-of-practice focusing on bringing together trainers who conduct trainings in languages other than English to learn from each other and share insights and together problem-solve challenges. Additionally, as the curriculum is hosted by OCCD, OCCD will take charge of reviewing and updating the curriculum on a routine basis as well as continuing to conduct TOTs as needed as they do with their other curricula.

In addition to our training-of-trainers, we continue to conduct TOPs targeting communities identified as highest need by our Maternal, Infant, Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) needs assessment report. We conducted two TOPs in identified communities and one TOP at the state Oregon Association for the Education of Young Children conference adding an additional 75 providers trained on implementing the ASQ in early childhood settings. We have also contracted with one of our Spanish-speaking Master Trainers to conduct a minimum of one TOP in Spanish.

The ASQ curriculum, in part, promotes the use of the free on-line version of the ASQ available in Oregon. Since September 2008 the creators of the ASQ at the University of Oregon (UO) have conducted research on the ASQ using data acquired through public use of the tool available on their website. Parents can go to ASQ Oregon website, download the ASQ questionnaire and screen their child free of charge. During 2015, the first full year of implementation of the ASQ curriculum, UO saw a 25% increase in completed ASQs on-line, increasing from 2303 in 2014 to 4000 in 2015. While it is not possible to directly correlate our trainings with this increased use of the website, it is clear that, overall, there are increasing numbers of screening occurring through this alternative means of screening. Additionally, Oregon continues to show an increasing number of developmental screenings occurring in medical settings as well calling for exploration of how there can be greater cross-sector screening coordination. Efforts are underway to explore means by which all screening including those in medical settings and those on-line can be captured, tallied, shared across providers, aggregated, analyzed and tracked (see below).

As introductory information to the ASQ training and in partnership with University of Oregon, we have sponsored creation and delivery of two 1-hour webinars, "Introduction to Developmental Screening" and "Working with Parents to Screen Their Young Children". Both early childhood professionals and parents were intended audience. Fifty-five participants attended our first webinar; 48 attended the second. Evaluations were consistently positive. Plans are to translate, deliver and record the webinars in Spanish. Finally, recording of both the English and Spanish webinars will be posted on-line. An additional webinar is scheduled to provide an on-line brief ASQ training for Quality Improvement Specialists statewide who provide technical assistance on implementation of developmental screening to participants in Oregon's Quality Rating Improvement System (TQRIS). This is an added facet of our ongoing work to assure that our curriculum aligns with TQRIS.

In our work with early childhood professionals across the state, we have learned that training on social emotional (SE) development is a significant training need. To ascertain what SE topic, specifically, would be of greatest importance and currently a gap in training, we conducted a two-pronged statewide community assessment involving (A) face-to-face interviews of early childhood workforce managers and supervisors and (B) on-line survey of early childhood professionals. We conducted 19 interviews including four representatives of culturally specific organizations and provided a survey in the top five languages spoken in Oregon (English, Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese and Chinese) and received survey responses from 807 providers. After full analysis of findings, the two topics identified and consistent across both approaches were (1) How to help children focus, pay attention and build self-control in home and preschool settings and (2) How trauma affects learning. We have explored ways for aligning this new curriculum with other initiatives in the state and have identified the following opportunities: (a) alignment with Oregon's Child Care and Development Fund to provide social emotional development training to child care providers, (b) Oregon's standards and guidelines for transition into kindergarten currently under development and (c) Oregon's priority on kindergarten readiness. Development of the curriculum will be an iterative process in close collaboration with community stakeholders including culturally-specific agencies.



### Cross-Systems Coordination/Health Information Exchange

As the number of developmental screenings in early childhood settings continue to grow, the importance of coordination and sharing of information becomes increasingly relevant to the process. One option that we will be exploring is feasibility of electronic transmission of screenings occurring on the ASQ Oregon website through an existing health information exchange to the child's medical provider. We are currently in negotiations with University of Oregon to partner with a health information exchange entity in the state and provide a report on potential ability, barriers and costs associated with data transfer from the ASQ Oregon website to medical providers that is fully HIPAA compliant.

### Leverage of Funds

Following a collective impact model, we continue to leverage our Race to the Top funding with our Early Childhood Coordinated Systems (ECCS) funding promoting developmental screening.

Additionally, in 2015 we partnered with Oregon's Transformation Center and Early Learning Hubs through State Innovative Model (SIM) grant and private funding to organize and host a 2015 Health & Early Learning Forum. A total of 140 representatives from both Oregon's CCOs and community-based Early Learning Hubs met on November 16, 2015. Through a world café featuring nine projects from across the state, attendees shared innovative community programs and explored ways for working together across health and early learning and discover opportunities for partnering and collaboration. Appropriately, further information on the Forum is posted on the both Oregon Health Authority website (<http://www.oregon.gov/oha/Transformation-Center/Pages/Coordinated-Care-Model-Summit.aspx>) and the Early Learning Division of the Oregon Department of Education website (<http://oregonearlylearning.com/health-and-early-learning-forum/>).

Again, through leveraging SIM grant funding, we are contracting with Oregon Pediatric Improvement Partnership (OPIP) to conduct a pilot in a rural community to map out resources and develop tools for facilitating referral. A challenge widely recognized related to developmental screening is follow through with referral recommendations for a developmental diagnostic evaluation of children who screen at risk for developmental delays. In Oregon, as in most other states, children are too frequently lost to follow up and do not receive the diagnostic evaluation that can lead to appropriate developmental interventions to address delays early. This project will conduct an environmental scan, map referral pathways and community resources and drawing from that knowledge, construct methodology and tools to overcome barriers and challenges to follow through on recommendations. The goal is that information gathered from this project and tools created will be generalizable and tailored as necessary to share with communities.

### Equity

Equity continues to be infused in all of our work. As described above:

- our trainings focus on communities farthest from opportunity,
- we have contracted with one of our Spanish-speaking trainers to conduct training-of-providers in Spanish,
- trained trainers with capacity to deliver trainings in languages other than English,
- translated our training into Spanish and Russian,
- plan to translate and deliver webinars in Spanish,
- conducted our social emotional training needs interviews and survey intentionally targeting culturally specific communities and
- plan to organize and facilitate a community-of-practice for trainers conducting trainings in

a language other than English.

To conclude, we look forward to an exciting final year of the RTT-ELC grant, completing our project and assuring that our accomplishments are carried onward by our community stakeholders across the state.

**Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)**

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

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

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

**Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Data Notes**

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

Source: Oregon's Health System Transformation 2015 Mid-Year Performance Report, January 12, 2016, Measure period, July 2014 - June 2015, <http://www.oregon.gov/oha/Metrics/Documents/2015%20Mid-Year%20Report%20-%20Jan%202016.pdf>, retrieved January 20, 2016.

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

Source: Oregon's Health System Transformation 2015 Mid-Year Performance Report, January 12, 2016, Measure period, July 2014 - June 2015, <http://www.oregon.gov/oha/Metrics/Documents/2015%20Mid-Year%20Report%20-%20Jan%202016.pdf>, retrieved January 20, 2016.

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

Source: Oregon's Health System Transformation 2015 Mid-Year Performance Report, January 2016; Measure period, July 2014 - June 2015, <http://www.oregon.gov/oha/Metrics/Documents/2015%20Mid-Year%20Report%20-%20Jan%202016.pdf>, retrieved January 20, 2016.

Measure description: Percentage of children on Medicaid who had at least six well-child visits with a health care provider by age 15 months. CY 2011 baseline: 29,385 (68%).

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

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

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

Data source for number of children with high needs referred for services who received follow-up treatment: Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Referral and Evaluation Report, ODE, 2015.

Oregon's developmental screening continues to exceed our targeted developmental screening rate. This year Oregon's screenings for Mid-Year 2015 exceed our target by 86%. This is a dramatic increase in screening even compared to last year's excellent performance. Last year's screenings exceeded last year's target by 16.6%. The percent of children enrolled in Medicaid receiving a developmental screening has also shown significant improvement. The percent of children enrolled in Medicaid Mid-Year 2015 was 49.5%. This is a 14.3 percentage-point improvement over Mid-Year 2014's rate of 35.2%. Developmental screening is an incentive metric for which CCOs receive financial incentives when demonstrating improved rates of developmental screening in medical clinics. An additional

positive influence on developmental screening with the communities is the creation of 16 Early Learning Hubs (ELHs) covering the entire state. These ELHs are community-based organizations charged with addressing health disparities among their respective populations of children birth to five years old. A focus of their work is promoting developmental screening in collaboration with their local health clinics. The improvements in developmental screening are likely attributed to this Collective Impact approach to screening. The Oregon Health Authority's Health and Analytics Division continues to closely track performance of our Coordinated Care Organizations. Similarly, efforts are underway to track and document ELH's contribution to developmental screening. Project 5 of our RTT-ELC grant continues to focus on early childhood workforce development training child care providers and preschool teachers on implementation of developmental screening in their early childhood settings. A critical component of the training involves sharing results of developmental screenings with the medical provider. As this focus for conducting screenings and communicating results to the medical provider continues to build, we anticipate that the number of children enrolled in Medicaid will continue to grow.

Oregon's number of children enrolled in Medicaid receiving well child care is 29% lower than our target and a decrease of 16.5% when compared to last year's report. However, the actual number of children receiving this service increased compared to last year's report (personal communication). For 2015 Mid-Year reporting, 88.3% of children had a visit with a medical provider. The decrease of 16.5% is due to inclusion criterion change since the last reporting year. In the previous reporting year, continuous enrollment in (any) CCO was the method used for this datum. These reporting children are now counted for this metric only when they have remained within the same CCO for the reporting year. Children who shifted from one CCO to another during the report year were not counted in this measure. This stricter criterion for inclusion led to fewer children included in the numerator and, therefore, is an artifact of data inclusion and not a reflection of fewer children receiving well child visits. Statewide CCO efforts to engage and serve Medicaid children continue. Oregon's Health and Analytics continue to monitor CCO performance for this metric closely. Early Learning Hubs metrics are also tracking this.

The number of children up-to-date in their schedule of well child care increased by 38.6% compared to last year's reporting. The previously reported baseline, Year-1 and targets were founded on National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH) reporting, which reports every four years. Meaningful comparison of our performance to targets set in accordance to NSCH data is challenging. Last year we shifted to our annual CCO data and are reporting our CCO data again this year. Comparison of last year's performance to this year's carries importantly meaningful information. Considering our performance as reported in 2014 CCO data to this year's CCO data, the number of children served increased by 38.6%, indicating a significant improvement. The performance of CCOs on this metric continues to be closely monitored by Oregon's Health and Analytics team.

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

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

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

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

Not applicable.

OREGON DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA C(4) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

### Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

(Section D(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in developing (check all that apply):

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

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

In 2015, Oregon continued to refine the revised Workforce Knowledge and Competencies (WKC). WKC was reviewed by 11 focus groups and was on the web for public comment and feedback for four months. All feedback has been summarized and the document is in final draft. The next step will be to work with a designer to create a user friendly format and then to publish. Highlights of the findings include a desire to keep the core knowledge categories (CKC) of Special Needs and Diversity as stand-alone categories to ensure an appropriate focus on these important areas. The focus groups also articulated a desire to thread these themes throughout the other CKC's, so topics of diversity and special needs could be represented and appropriately addressed throughout Oregon's Core Body of Knowledge.

We continue to have 12 of the 13 community colleges that align their coursework with the CBK standards. As we wrap up RTT-ELC, the goal is to increase this to 13, following the release of the CBK summary document. We continue to exceed our early childhood education workforce targets.

A common progression of credentials and degree work continued at Oregon's Annual Grand Articulation Summit in the spring of 2015. Approximately 70 participants attended, including community college staff, RTT-ELC funded students, and early learning professionals from partner agencies (e.g., Child Care Resource and Referral). A panel of community college representatives who are part of the "Early Learning Development Professional Consortium" spoke to the audience about institutional barriers that they were able to remove and restructure that allowed diverse students to navigate through the community college system. Community college staff asked questions and learned of additional options that may work in their college setting. These types of panels allow for more resource sharing and collaborations outside of this meeting. The community college department chairs had an opportunity to hear from Race to the Top Scholarship students as they served on a panel and discussed successes and barriers they experienced as adult college students. The RTT-ELC Supplemental Scholarship students are on average 41 years old and often have young families of their own to care for after a day of providing child care for their employment. Online courses have been critical to this population. Some additional successes, included colleges that offered courses in languages, locations, and times most convenient to these non-traditional students.



## Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.

(Section D(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs with the goal of improving child outcomes (check all that apply):

- Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;
- Implementing policies and incentives that promote professional and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention, including
  - Scholarships
  - Compensation and wage supplements,
  - Tiered reimbursement rates,
  - Other financial incentives
  - Management opportunities
- Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention
- Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for --
  - Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and
  - Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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

Oregon has a well-established professional development system with a Career Lattice that connects with state licensing to track and document ongoing training requirements and degree attainment. In 2015, the Oregon Registry received 3809 applications to be evaluated for a registry step.

The professional development system also has an established Trainer Program which utilizes the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework to offer training to the field. Efforts have continued to increase the number of trainers within the Trainer Program that have the ability to train in languages other than English. We currently have 147 community trainers and 276 master trainers in Spanish, Russian, Chinese, and Vietnamese. In alignment with the Early Learning Division's priority to lead with Equity, we have prioritized increasing the number of trainers and have implemented a plan to increase the number of trainings executed within a variety of languages within the state.

Additional progress has been made in creating partnerships involving community colleges.

Over the last year community colleges have moved courses to rural areas, taught courses in Spanish, and used live video options of courses taking place in other community colleges.

These courses and options are designed to be flexible in meeting the needs of the existing early childhood workforce and provide a comprehensive array of supports to individuals completing degrees in Early Childhood Education.

Individuals who achieved a milestone on the Oregon Registry were awarded an education award, which ranged from \$100.00 - \$500.00. These education awards are intended to recognize and incentivize the workforce to implement quality standards within their programs. Tiered reimbursements for star rated programs serving children on subsidies will begin in April 2016. In 2015, 3058 educational awards were distributed. Through the end of the grant, we will continue to provide education awards to those who achieve a step on the Oregon registry.

**Performance Measures (D)(2)(d)(1):**

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for: Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.**

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

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.**

<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers</b>	12	12	12	12	
<b>Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider</b>	2,155	2,788	4,141	5,245	

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

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

Aligned institutions- defined as community colleges

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

The data source for these metrics is the Oregon Registry.

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

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

Oregon continues to refine the revised Core Body of Knowledge. It was reviewed by 11 focus groups and was on the web for public comment and feedback for four months. All feedback has been summarized and the document is in final draft. The next step will be to work with a designer to create a user friendly format and then to publish by December 2016. We are still at 12 community colleges that report that they align their coursework with the Core Body of Knowledge standards. Once the revised Core Body of Knowledge is complete, we will work with the last community college in Oregon that does not align with the CBK to acquire alignment agreement.

**Performance Measures (D)(2)(d)(2):**

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for: Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.**

**Actuals**

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

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

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

Data is documented through the Oregon Registry. Percentage represents number of participants with that credential related to total of teachers, Head Teachers, Directors and providers that are recorded in the Oregon Office of Child Care's Criminal Background Registry. Total for 14-15 is 13,130.

In the past years reports we have reported separately the number of Head Start positions. At this time, most of the Head Start programs are licensed due to Oregon's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement Systems and are enrolled and engaged in the Oregon Registry where training and education for licensing and the Career Lattice is submitted. We wanted to avoid duplication of those positions so we did not report the Head Start staff numbers separately this year.

Data Extracted from the ODE Special Education staff position collection for the 14-15 school year: Total 904  
525 Special Education Paraprofessionals  
379 EI/ECSE Specialist with Bachelor degrees.

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

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

Oregon continues to do well with our workforce targets. We continue to exceed in some areas such as cross sector trainers and providers who have an Oregon Registry Step 10/bachelor's degree or Oregon Registry Steps 7 - 8.5/CDA/Oregon Registry Credential. The areas where we are not meeting the target this year are just slightly below where we expected. During the last year of the grant, we are confident that we will meet or exceed all targets. The TQRIS and the upcoming Tiered Rating Reimbursement rating system will provide more motivation which will help to increase the target numbers.



## Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

The State has made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that (check all that apply):

- Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;
- Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the fourth year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten. States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;
- Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and
- Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Describe the domain coverage of the State's Kindergarten Entry Assessment, validity and reliability efforts regarding the Kindergarten Entry Assessment, and timing of the administration of the Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

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

#### Social and Emotional Development/Approaches to Learning

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

#### Cognition and General Knowledge

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

## Language and Literacy

The statewide Kindergarten Assessment includes an early literacy measure, modified from the EasyCBM assessment from the University of Oregon. The measure includes both English letter names and English letter sounds. The assessment also includes Spanish letter sounds for officially identified Spanish-speaking English Learners. Validity studies of the instruments have included populations of African-American, Latino, and other racial-ethnic groups. The EasyCBM measures were developed to be used within a RTI system and went through both reliability and validity studies.

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

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

In 2015, Oregon completed the third statewide administration of the kindergarten assessment. In November, the Oregon Department of Education and the Early Learning Division initiated a statewide recruitment for members to participate in a long standing Kindergarten Assessment Advisory Panel. Panelists included kindergarten teachers, early learning providers, administrators, and specialists with a wide representation of Oregon's diverse communities. Applicants were selected based upon their experiences with diverse populations, socio-economic diversity, and English Learners.

The panel was charged with providing recommendations to:

- Improve the implementation and administration of Oregon's Kindergarten Assessment;
- Recommend future test items; and
- Ensure that test administration and measures are culturally responsive and help to eliminate opportunity gaps from communities of color and students who are emerging bilinguals.

The panel also examined the results from the 2015-16 Kindergarten Assessment, the revised Head Start Learning Outcomes Framework, and the standards alignment work to provide recommendations for interpretive guidance to the field. The panel, along with leadership from the Oregon Department of Education and the Early Learning Division, produced an interpretive guidance report and guidance document to help stakeholders interpret the assessment results. The report includes a developmental continuum that includes the following benchmark levels; Developing, Approaching, and Demonstrating and Above. The benchmark levels will serve as a baseline for student growth in subsequent years and allow effective targeting of resources where they are most needed.

Stakeholder feedback led to a decision to make the Kindergarten Assessment “non-secure” in 2016-17, which allows for greater transparency about the skills assessed. For clarity, “secure” refers to the materials and not the assessment results. The benefits of making the assessment non-secure are that parents and early childcare providers will be able to teach the self-regulatory behaviors that are essential for academic success. In addition, schools and districts will be able to use the data from the assessment in a timely manner, allowing for informed instructional decisions and allocation of resources.

Oregon continues to collaborate with other states around the development of

new and improved assessments for kindergarten entry. Representatives from the Oregon Department of Education attended the CCSSO Early Childhood Education Assessment meeting in October, 2015 in Washington D.C and are planning to attend the conferences in the winter and spring. In addition, Oregon continues to engage in the K-3 Assessment Consortium led by North Carolina. This is a nine state consortium that has been awarded a federal enhanced assessment grant. A representative from the Oregon Department of Education attended the Executive Committee meeting in January in Chicago and will attend the meeting in May, 2016.

Over the last few months, the Oregon Department of Education and the Early Learning Division have been involved in extensive research, interpretation of data, and engagement of stakeholders, that included a meeting of the Kindergarten Assessment Advisory Panel. As a result, the changes for the Kindergarten Assessment are as follows:

- 1) The creation of a 3-Year Plan which was approved by the Kindergarten Assessment Core Team.

The plan centers around continuous improvement and the addition of a vocabulary measure, as well as revisions to the math items.

- 2) Changes for the 2016-17 assessment include revisions to the Early Literacy measure. The measure will change from timed letter name and letter sound fluency to untimed letter and sound recognition. (26 English upper case letters, 26 lower case letters, 26 English sounds, and 26 Spanish sounds for officially identified Spanish English Learners.


A linking study will be conducted by ODE for longitudinal data. 1,000-1,500 students will be assessed in both the original timed Early Literacy measures, in addition to the new untimed Early Literacy measures.

- 3) The data from the 2015-16 assessment will be released on February 8<sup>th</sup>. Results from this year's data are largely consistent with the prior two years.
- 4) The Kindergarten Assessment Advisory Panel met for two days in November to begin to develop interpretive guidance to the Kindergarten Assessment in the area of Approaches to Learning. Scores from the Approaches to Learning are depicted along a developmental continuum which includes three benchmark levels: Developing, Approaching, and Demonstrating and Above. The benchmark level expectations will help provide a baseline for student growth in subsequent years and enable teachers to identify targeted areas of support.
- 5) Preparation for the Spanish Panel , a subset of the Kindergarten Assessment Advisory Panel, is underway. The Spanish Panel will return for a half-day meeting at the end of February to review current research on Early Spanish Literacy and discuss which Spanish letter sounds to use for the 2016-17 test administration.
- 6) ODE is still investigating the feasibility of conducting a small scale cognitive lab to assess the viability of implementing a digital data-entry interface (DEI) in 2016-17.

During the last year of the grant, Oregon's work related to the Kindergarten Assessment is focusing on strengthening both the administration and content of the assessment. A cross-agency Kindergarten Assessment work plan developed in 2015 identifies four primary focus

areas: communications, data analysis and interpretation, training and technical, and continuous improvement. This final category places emphasis on strengthening the assessment segments and measurement tools.

One immediate next step will be to revise the Spanish language and literacy measures. Currently, the assessment measures Spanish letter sound fluency for children who have been identified as native Spanish-speakers upon kindergarten entry. In February, 2016, cross-agency staff will convene a Spanish Language and Literacy Panel to help identify measures that provide a more robust picture of children's early Spanish language and literacy development, and which could potentially be incorporated into Oregon's Kindergarten Assessment as early as fall, 2016.

Additionally, in collaboration with early learning providers, K-12 educators, and community-based organizations, Oregon will be exploring revisions to the Kindergarten Assessment letter name and letter sound fluency measures. The rationale for re-examining these measures is to strengthen alignment between assessment measures and standards for children's early language and literacy development, as well as to gain a more complete picture of children's language and literacy skills upon kindergarten entry. Any new measures selected will need to be able to be cross-referenced to current measures to maintain data continuity from the first three years of assessment administration. Strengthening assessment measures, along with implementation and data interpretation supports, will help ensure that Oregon's Kindergarten Assessment is able to fully realize its potential as an important component in the growth and development of Oregon's P-3 continuum. 

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

The State has made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that (check all that apply):

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

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

The Oregon Department of Education's Early Learning Division (ELD) has made progress towards the implementation of their Early Learning Information System (ELIS) which will hold all facility and staff regulatory and licensing data along with child care quality rating and improvement (TQRIS) data.

In the spring of 2015, an IT director with 30 years implementing information systems and an experienced project manager were hired. After a process which involved the development of a software use matrix for every state the decision was made to purchase an existing child care and TQRIS software system used by other states. An RFP was released last fall, which resulted in the selection of vendor to develop ELIS. Negotiations are underway with the selected vendor.

In 2016, we will work closely to the vendor to ensure that ELIS develops within the established time frames. Strategies include working with ELD staff to map out the differences of the existing vendor system to the ELD requirements. Design and development will be completed followed by system and user acceptance testing. Training will occur once user acceptance testing has completed and ELD deems the software ready for release. The goal is to have this completed by December 2016.

## Data Tables

### Commitment to early learning and development.

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

<b>Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income<sup>1</sup> families, by age</b>		
	<b>Number of children from Low-Income families in the State</b>	<b>Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State</b>
<b>Infants under age 1</b>	22,395	20%
<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	47,006	41.9%
<b>Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry</b>	42,681	38.1%
<b>Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families</b>	112,082	100%

<sup>1</sup> Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.

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

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

Source for children in low-income families by age is Child Population by Poverty: 2015 1 yr Public Use Microdata Sample, American Community Survey.

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

The State should use these data to guide its thinking about where specific activities may be required to address special populations' unique needs.

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays <sup>1</sup>	10,810	4.3%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	34,829	15.3%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	795	0.3%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	3,065	1.3%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	1,442	0.62%
Are in foster care	5,025	2.15%
Other 1 as identified by the State	2,845	1.2%
<i>Describe:</i>	Urban Native American/ Alaska Native Birth-5 in Portland Metro area	
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

<sup>1</sup>For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).

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

<sup>3</sup>For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2).

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

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

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

English Learners data source: 2014 1 yr American Community Survey.

Reside on Indian Lands: no updated data available since previous reports.

Migrant: report from state data report provided by Jonathan Fernow, Migrant Education Coordinator.



**Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age**

Note: A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

<b>Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	20	44	7,858	7,922
<i>Specify:</i>	Includes state-funded Early Head Start and Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten.			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	HS 2015 PIR			
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	659	2,138	6,666	9,463
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2015 PIR report (Region X, Region XI American Indian Head Start, Region XII Migran			
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	613	3,414	6,783	10,810
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Annual Special Education Child Count, 2015.			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	0	0	415	415
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Consolidated State Performance Final Report, 2015.			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	991	5,313	8,936	16,652
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	ACF-801, Oct 2014-Sept 2015			
<b>Other 1</b>	5,934	3,013	1,263	10,210
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting -- public health programs, Healthy Families Oregon, MIECHV			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Oregon Health Authority, Public Health Division, Office of Family Health, 2015 report			
<b>Other 2</b>	629	1,254	1,238	3,013
<i>Specify:</i>	Relief Nurseries			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Self report by each nursery to Oregon Association of Relief Nurseries (OARN) by cal			
<b>Other 3</b>	168	1,272	1,448	2,888
<i>Specify:</i>	TANF			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Department of Human Services provider pay claims and claims history January 1, 20			
<b>Other 4</b>	775	3,771	5,876	10,402
<i>Specify:</i>	Employment-Related Day Care (ERDC)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Department of Human Services Provider pay claims and claims history, January 1, 20			
<b>Other 5</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 6</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

**Table (A)(1)-3a - Additional Other rows**

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
<b>Other 7</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 8</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

<sup>1</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

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

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

Head Start/Early Head Start: (including Migrant/Seasonal and Tribal Head Start) data from Head Start Enterprise System 2014 Program Information Reports (PIR); state-funded preschool data provided by programs using 2015 PIR forms submitted to ELD

Home visiting: Overall, there was a decline of 15% in number of infants, toddlers and preschoolers served across the four home visiting programs this year compared to 2014. The decline for infants and toddlers was 21% and 22%, respectively. In contrast, the number of preschoolers served this year nearly doubled, increasing from 669 in 2014 to 1263 this year, an 89% increase.

We have explored possible causes for this decline and discovered that the Special Supplemental Nutritional Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program also saw a decline in participation in their program. During the 2015 calendar year, WIC experienced a drop of 5,600 children representing a 5.7% decline from January to December. The greatest decline was among children less than two years of age. The WIC program is a significant source of referrals to Babies First, Oregon's largest home visiting program. This association likely contributed to the 31% (1,111 infants) decline in enrollment among infants into the Babies First home visiting program. Another consideration is Oregon's health care transformation and health care coverage expansion. Ninety-five percent of Oregonians have health care coverage. As more pregnant women have a medical home prior to pregnancy, fewer are accessing Oregon's Mother's Care program for the uninsured. This has historically been a significant referral source for the Maternity Case Management home visiting program. Oregon Health Authority is in the process of bringing targeted case management reimbursement, a component of home visiting, under the purview of CCOs. With this closer connection of home visiting with Oregon's Medicaid recipients, home visiting services will become an additional component of care adding to physical, mental and dental health already co-existing within CCOs.

Relief Nursery data obtained from programs.

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

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

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	1,091	49	12	69	18	97	401
<i>Specify:</i>	Fall 2015 State quarterly demographic report (submitted by programs)						
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	7,995	599	323	1,072	104	1,430	5,140
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	927	34	125	71	12	135	2,723
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,684	74	168	175	29	260	4,393
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	129	10	12	14	4	17	224
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	6,528	357	278	2,598	230	3,166	13,752
Other 1	789	92	13	121	17	167	1,645
<i>Describe:</i>	Relief Nurseries						
Other 2							
<i>Describe:</i>							

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

**Table (A)(1)-3b - Additional Other rows**

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
<b>Other 3</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 4</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 5</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 6</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 7</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 8</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							

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

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

Data source for state-funded preschool: Fall 2015 state demographic report (submitted by programs). Migrant/Seasonal and Tribal Head Start extrapolated from 2014 Head Start Program Information Reports.

Programs funded by IDEA, Part C, Data Source: Annual Special Education Child Count, 2014-15

Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619, Data Source: Annual Special Education Child Count, 2014-15

Programs funded by Title I, ESEA, Data Source: the Consolidated State Performance Plan, 2013-14

CCDF: ACF 801 Data, October 2014 - September 2015

2015 Relief Nurseries data collected from programs. 169 were categorized as “unknown” and not added to the chart.

**Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.**

Note: For States that have a biennial State budget, please complete for all fiscal years for which State funds have been appropriated. We are not asking for forecasting, but for actual allocations. Therefore, States that do not have biennial budgets need not complete for years for which appropriations do not yet exist.

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

**Table (A)(1)-4 - Additional Other rows**

**Funding for each Fiscal Year**

Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
<b>Other State contributions 7</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 8</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Total State contributions:</b>	<b>\$160,882,138</b>	<b>\$174,179,123</b>	<b>\$182,249,364</b>	<b>\$202,381,316</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

<sup>2</sup> Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.

<sup>3</sup> Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

**Data Table A(1)-4 Data Notes**

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data, including the State's fiscal year end date.

State general fund allocation for state EHS = \$793,155.62 and for OPK = \$69,999,910.24 (state funded preschool meets Head Start Standards but is listed separately here).

State contributions to IDEA Part C, Data Source: Oregon Early Intervention and Early Childhood Legislatively Approved Budget for 2014-15.

State contributions to IDEA Part b, Section 619, Data Source: Oregon Early Intervention and Early Childhood Legislatively Approved Budget for 2014-15.

2015 Relief Nurseries data collected from programs.

Portland Children's Levy- FY 2014/15 data: the levy revenues increase is based on increased property values. Those increased revenues were used to increase Levy investments in services for children, including in early childhood services and in child abuse prevention & intervention services for the early childhood population.

**Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State**

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs. However, the current year should match the program totals reported in Table (A)(1)-3a.

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

<sup>1</sup> Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.

<sup>2</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.



**Data Table A(1)-5 Data Notes**

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed. Include current year if data are available.

State funded preschool includes all Oregon Head Start Prekindergarten and Oregon Early Head Start funded slots (from ELD report of 2015 funded slots); federal slots include federal Head Start and Early Head Start (including Migrant/Seasonal and Tribal Head Start funded enrollment from 2014 Program Information Reports after subtracting non-ACF funded slots).

Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619, Data Source: Annual Special Education Child Count, 2014-15.

Programs funded under Title I of ESEA, Data Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, 2013-14)

2015 Relief Nurseries data collected from programs.

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

Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

Not applicable.

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

Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool	X	X	X	X	
<i>Specify:</i>					
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	X	X	X	X	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	X	X			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	X	X			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X	X		X	
Programs receiving CCDF funds					
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)					
Tier 1					
Tier 2					
Tier 3	X		X		
Tier 4	X	X	X		
Tier 5	X	X	X	X	
State licensing requirements					
Other 1	X	X	X	X	
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting Programs funded by the Affordable Care Act Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visitation Program				
Other 2					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

**Table (A)(1)-7 - Additional Other rows**

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
<b>Other 6</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 7</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 8</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					

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

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

Not applicable.

## Budget and Expenditures

### Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

Major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and total expenditures for year 3 are in three budget categories:

Travel: Expenditures higher than budgeted. Work with partner programs, coordination of services and continuation of regional Hubs account for increase in expenditures over approved budget.

Supplies: Expenditures higher than budgeted. Project 7 accounts for the majority of the higher expenditures. The State of Oregon is purchasing Vroom materials directly and distributing to local partners. The 2014 budget amended reflected the cost under line 6, contractual. Year 4 budget for project 7 will be adjusted to reflect an increase for supplies and a decrease to contractual work to account for the purchase and distribution of Vroom materials.

Contractual: Lower than budgeted as work continues to obtain services and sign contracts for project 6 and 7. Budget adjustments to year 4 will be made as well as no-cost extension request in April to complete work.

Funds distributed to localities and partner programs: lower than budgeted. Execution of contracts delayed payment of services by December 31, 2015 as well as the period ended before organizations submitted quarterly invoices for payment.

### Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

## **Project Budget 1**

**Project Name: Grant Management**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

The largest discrepancies in project 1, grant management, approved budget and our total expenditures is in expenditures for set aside funds and contracts. For set aside funds, the State received approval to utilize funds for work with Mass Ingenuity strategic planning sessions. The cost of the work was less than anticipated and available State General Fund dollars were utilized to pay for this contract. The State has received permission to use \$100K in set aside funds for an equity training project.

For contract work, the State also utilized to General Fund dollars to pay for work initially identified as Race to the Top. Utilizing General Fund dollars for the contract payments, allowed for additional dollars for travel, small equipment purchases (phones, lap tops) and supplies to support the project one work.

### **Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Year 4 projected budget will reflect an increase in personnel, fringe benefits and travel and supplies to support project one work. Increase in personnel and fringe benefits reflect the costs of staff hired to perform the work of project one.

## Project Budget 2

**Project Name:** TQRIS Validation Study

---

### Project Budget Narrative

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

Work for project 2 is contracted with Oregon State University. Contractual issues have slowed the payment for services but the work continues and year four budget will reflect payments for a portion of year 3 and year 4 work.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Due to issues surrounding the execution of a contract with Oregon State University, year 4 budget will be adjusted to reflect payments for year 3 and year 4.



### **Project Budget 3**

**Project Name:** Increase Participation of ELDP of TQRIS

---

#### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

Personal and frindge benefits were lower than budgeted. Contractual expenditures were lower than budgeted.

#### **Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Year 4 budget will be adjusted to maximize grant funds. State is anticipating requesting a no-cost extension.

## **Project Budget 4**

**Project Name: Workforce Build Capacity**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

Personnel and fringe benefit expenditures are lower than approved budget as the State moved staff from Race to the Top to other existing funding streams to assist with sustain the investment of the grant.

Travel expenditures were higher than budgeted to cover the work of project 4. The move of personnel to other funding streams assisted in covering the cost of travel.

As with project 2, contract issues delayed payment of invoices to localities, organizations, and partners.

### **Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Year 4 budget will be adjusted to maximize grant funds. State is anticipating requesting a no-cost extension.

## **Project Budget 5**

**Project Name:** Improve Rates of Developmental Screening at Regular Intervals

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

Works continues for project 5, however, invoicing between agencies remains slow and payments for the last few months of year 3 were outstanding as of December 31, 2015. Year 4 budget will be increased to reflect these payments.

### **Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Increase to year 4 budget to account for payments not made before December 31, 2015 year end close.

## **Project Budget 6**

**Project Name: TQRIS Data**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

The State has issued an intent to award for the building of the new data system under project 6 and contract negotiations are in final stages. Work should begin over the next couple of months.

### **Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Year 4 budget for project 6 will be increased to reflect work on the data system. Once the contract is executed, more detailed budget information will be available. It is our intent to move forward with a no-cost extension request to continue project 6 work.

## Project Budget 7

**Project Name: Public Access**

---

### Project Budget Narrative

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

Procurement of services for a new referral system, website development, QRIS branding/ community outreach are moving forward but contracts were not in place as anticipated for year 3.

The State received a grant from the Bezos Foundation to fund a position to roll out Vroom through the State of Oregon. Grants have been issued, materials are being distributed to communities and translations into additional languages have begun.

Supplies budget is over the approved budget as the State of Oregon is purchasing the Vroom materials and distributing to local partners. The approved budget for this work was projected under contractual. Year four budget for supplies will be increased and contracts decrease to account for the State purchasing the materials directly.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Year 3 actual expenditures were lower than anticipated and year 4 budget will be increased to reflect increased expenditures. This budget is being reviewed and a no-cost extension may be requested to continue work as well as a budget amendment to utilize funds for other projects within the Race To The Top grant.

## Project Budget 8

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

---

### Project Budget Narrative

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

Work continues on this project; however the State did not hold a conference projected in year 3's approved budget, as anticipated.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Year 4 budget will be adjusted to reflect a conference.

## **Project Budget 9**

**Project Name: Oregon Kindergarten Assessment**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

Work continues on project and no major discrepancies between approved budget and total expenditures.

### **Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

There will be a slight increase in year 4 budget projections to maximize remaining funds.



**Project Budget 10**

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Budget Narrative**

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

THE OREGON RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 9 PROJECTS.  
PAGES 90-109 HAVE BEEN DELETED.

**Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

**RTT-ELC Budget Summary of Actual Expenditures**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$153,799.00	\$796,742.51	\$1,470,591.45	\$0.00	\$2,421,132.96
2. Fringe Benefits	\$80,147.00	\$361,661.06	\$650,694.46	\$0.00	\$1,092,502.52
3. Travel	\$691.00	\$56,367.60	\$75,373.63	\$0.00	\$132,432.23
4. Equipment	\$616.00	\$16,894.86	\$13,715.32	\$0.00	\$31,226.18
5. Supplies	\$7,718.00	\$43,648.92	\$118,510.38	\$0.00	\$169,877.30
6. Contractual	\$62,727.00	\$457,503.38	\$219,164.62	\$0.00	\$739,395.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$4,018.37	\$14,936.08	\$0.00	\$18,954.45
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$305,698.00	\$1,736,836.70	\$2,562,985.94	\$0.00	\$4,605,520.64
10. Indirect Costs*	\$22,563.00	\$272,922.54	\$441,716.88	\$0.00	\$737,202.42
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$1,342,325.00	\$3,503,253.24	\$5,616,636.15	\$0.00	\$10,462,214.39
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$9,023.00	\$23,183.41	\$56,118.10	\$0.00	\$88,324.51
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$1,679,609.00	\$5,536,195.89	\$8,677,457.07	\$0.00	\$15,893,261.96
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$357,731,587.00	\$41,173,810.00	\$528,368,131.00	\$0.00	\$927,273,528.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$359,411,196.00	\$46,710,005.89	\$537,045,588.07	\$0.00	\$943,166,789.96

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 1 - Grant Management**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$49,861.00	\$181,692.19	\$306,134.68	\$0.00	\$537,687.87
2. Fringe Benefits	\$25,003.00	\$75,935.58	\$135,084.93	\$0.00	\$236,023.51
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,622.93	\$5,687.14	\$0.00	\$7,310.07
4. Equipment	\$413.00	\$0.00	\$2,594.42	\$0.00	\$3,007.42
5. Supplies	\$2,691.00	\$5,945.75	\$7,816.74	\$0.00	\$16,453.49
6. Contractual	\$60,506.00	\$101,296.98	\$22,060.30	\$0.00	\$183,863.28
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$217.00	\$147.00	\$0.00	\$364.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$138,474.00	\$366,710.43	\$479,525.21	\$0.00	\$984,709.64
10. Indirect Costs*	\$4,607.00	\$73,082.54	\$97,213.00	\$0.00	\$174,902.54
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$9,023.00	\$23,183.41	\$56,118.10	\$0.00	\$88,324.51
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$152,104.00	\$462,976.38	\$632,856.31	\$0.00	\$1,247,936.69
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$152,104.00	\$462,976.38	\$632,856.31	\$0.00	\$1,247,936.69

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 2 - TQRIS Validation Studies**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$283.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$283.45
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$283.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$283.45
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$69,003.00	\$158,867.95	\$271,852.68	\$0.00	\$499,723.63
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$69,003.00	\$159,151.40	\$271,852.68	\$0.00	\$500,007.08
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$69,003.00	\$159,151.40	\$271,852.68	\$0.00	\$500,007.08

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 3 - Increase Participation of ELDP on the TQRIS**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$12,587.00	\$101,749.65	\$183,219.01	\$0.00	\$297,555.66
2. Fringe Benefits	\$7,286.00	\$55,801.10	\$79,193.42	\$0.00	\$142,280.52
3. Travel	\$9.00	\$10,615.71	\$6,680.63	\$0.00	\$17,305.34
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$1,693.14	\$2,302.47	\$0.00	\$3,995.61
5. Supplies	\$675.00	\$3,439.18	\$2,827.81	\$0.00	\$6,941.99
6. Contractual	\$2,221.00	\$0.00	\$18,787.64	\$0.00	\$21,008.64
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$300.00	\$660.44	\$0.00	\$960.44
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$22,778.00	\$173,598.78	\$293,671.42	\$0.00	\$490,048.20
10. Indirect Costs*	\$1,748.00	\$34,719.00	\$51,106.87	\$0.00	\$87,573.87
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$953,856.00	\$1,920,959.06	\$3,138,475.31	\$0.00	\$6,013,290.37
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$978,382.00	\$2,129,276.84	\$3,483,253.60	\$0.00	\$6,590,912.44
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$978,382.00	\$2,129,276.84	\$3,483,253.60	\$0.00	\$6,590,912.44

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Workforce Build Capacity**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$1,387.00	\$101,744.27	\$293,454.63	\$0.00	\$396,585.90
2. Fringe Benefits	\$554.00	\$43,154.80	\$135,793.04	\$0.00	\$179,501.84
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$24,154.14	\$47,172.03	\$0.00	\$71,326.17
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$4,814.62	\$6,900.67	\$0.00	\$11,715.29
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$24,142.01	\$7,327.86	\$0.00	\$31,469.87
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$240,721.65	\$10,126.50	\$0.00	\$250,848.15
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$3,217.92	\$3,351.13	\$0.00	\$6,569.05
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,941.00	\$441,949.41	\$504,125.86	\$0.00	\$948,016.27
10. Indirect Costs*	\$240.00	\$45,245.00	\$77,496.00	\$0.00	\$122,981.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$319,466.00	\$1,358,537.58	\$1,811,487.30	\$0.00	\$3,489,490.88
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$321,647.00	\$1,845,731.99	\$2,393,109.16	\$0.00	\$4,560,488.15
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$271,272,072.00	\$0.00	\$423,571,661.00	\$0.00	\$694,843,733.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$271,593,719.00	\$1,845,731.99	\$425,964,770.16	\$0.00	\$699,404,221.15

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 5 - Improve rates of developmental screening at regular intervals**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$394,676.86	\$0.00	\$394,676.86
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$394,676.86	\$0.00	\$394,676.86
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$85,449,072.00	\$41,173,810.00	\$104,796,470.00	\$0.00	\$231,419,352.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$85,449,072.00	\$41,173,810.00	\$105,191,146.86	\$0.00	\$231,814,028.86

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



**Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - TQRIS Data**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$82,765.00	\$223,143.77	\$293,531.40	\$0.00	\$599,440.17
2. Fringe Benefits	\$45,283.00	\$115,832.06	\$138,634.22	\$0.00	\$299,749.28
3. Travel	\$682.00	\$4,490.25	\$1,796.24	\$0.00	\$6,968.49
4. Equipment	\$203.00	\$5,548.42	\$1,715.27	\$0.00	\$7,466.69
5. Supplies	\$4,352.00	\$2,269.12	\$6,205.15	\$0.00	\$12,826.27
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$53,016.00	\$39,110.00	\$0.00	\$92,126.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$133,285.00	\$404,299.62	\$480,992.28	\$0.00	\$1,018,576.90
10. Indirect Costs*	\$15,150.00	\$75,257.00	\$70,225.17	\$0.00	\$160,632.17
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$64,888.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$64,888.65
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$148,435.00	\$544,445.27	\$551,217.45	\$0.00	\$1,244,097.72
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$148,435.00	\$544,445.27	\$551,217.45	\$0.00	\$1,244,097.72

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 7 - Public Access**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$29,828.76	\$124,328.83	\$0.00	\$154,157.59
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$8,888.25	\$40,738.52	\$0.00	\$49,626.77
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,867.19	\$0.00	\$3,867.19
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$2,167.07	\$202.49	\$0.00	\$2,369.56
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$5,469.10	\$91,481.32	\$0.00	\$96,950.42
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$62,468.75	\$128,424.83	\$0.00	\$190,893.58
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,456.04	\$0.00	\$1,456.04
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$108,821.93	\$390,499.22	\$0.00	\$499,321.15
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$6,953.00	\$78,088.00	\$0.00	\$85,041.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$144.00	\$0.00	\$144.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$115,774.93	\$468,731.22	\$0.00	\$584,506.15
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,010,443.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,010,443.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,010,443.00	\$115,774.93	\$468,731.22	\$0.00	\$1,594,949.15

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$7,199.00	\$143,878.82	\$178,591.52	\$0.00	\$329,669.34
2. Fringe Benefits	\$2,021.00	\$57,884.32	\$83,543.15	\$0.00	\$143,448.47
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$15,484.57	\$5,729.23	\$0.00	\$21,213.80
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$2,671.61	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,671.61
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$2,383.76	\$2,183.47	\$0.00	\$4,567.23
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,508.38	\$0.00	\$8,508.38
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$9,220.00	\$222,303.08	\$278,555.75	\$0.00	\$510,078.83
10. Indirect Costs*	\$818.00	\$33,345.00	\$46,376.84	\$0.00	\$80,539.84
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$10,038.00	\$255,648.08	\$324,932.59	\$0.00	\$590,618.67
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$10,038.00	\$255,648.08	\$324,932.59	\$0.00	\$590,618.67

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 9 - Oregon Kindergarten Assessment**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$14,705.05	\$91,331.38	\$0.00	\$106,036.43
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$4,164.95	\$37,707.18	\$0.00	\$41,872.13
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,441.17	\$0.00	\$4,441.17
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$668.03	\$0.00	\$668.03
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$655.35	\$0.00	\$655.35
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$813.09	\$0.00	\$813.09
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$18,870.00	\$135,616.20	\$0.00	\$154,486.20
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$4,321.00	\$21,211.00	\$0.00	\$25,532.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$23,191.00	\$156,827.20	\$0.00	\$180,018.20
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$23,191.00	\$156,827.20	\$0.00	\$180,018.20

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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