

# 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**

**Washington**

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#: S412A120035

2. Grantee Name Office of the Governor, State of Washington

3. Grantee Address P.O. Box 40002  
City: Olympia  
State: Washington Zip: 98504

4. Project Director Name: Ross Hunter  
Title: Director of the Washington State Department of Early Learning  
Phone #: (360) 725-4584 Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax #: (360) 725-4395  
Email: ross.hunter@del.wa.gov

### 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: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_

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.

Year 4 of Washington's Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) was one of preparing to sustain the programs beyond RTT-ELC support, and to ensure the scalability of the work. Washington made significant progress against all of the reform areas outlined on our RTT-ELC application. The five projects of Washington's RTT-ELC reform effort are highlighted below.

### Project 1: Grant Management

The Department of Early Learning (DEL) continues to improve the internal infrastructure and systems to support the ongoing management of the RTT-ELC reform areas.

#### Accomplishments

- **Early Start Act:** Passage of the Early Start Act (ESA) has provided significant new resources for early learning including internal capacity at the Department of Early Learning.
- **Early Achievers Review Subcommittee:** The 2015 Washington Legislature charged the Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) and DEL with convening an Early Achievers Review Subcommittee to provide feedback and guidance on strategies to improve the quality of instruction and environment for early learning and provide input and recommendations on the implementation and refinement of Early Achievers.

#### Challenges and Lessons Learned

- Build out of data systems continues to be challenging, particularly as programs have increasingly complex data requirements.
- Integration of data across state agencies continues to be challenging.

### Project 2: TQRIS Expansion

Early Achievers, Washington's TQRIS, has expanded its participation rates and the number of sites rated at Levels 3-5 in 2015.

#### Accomplishments

- 2,428 licensed centers and family homes are participating in Early Achievers, or 46.9 percent of all licensed providers.
- 2015 saw a significant increase in early care and education settings attaining higher levels of quality in Early Achievers. 565 licensed child care and family home were rated at a level 3, 4, or 5 as follows:
  - Child Care Centers: 356 have attained a Level 3 or higher, 23 percent of all licensed centers
  - Family Homes: 209 family homes attained a Level 3 or higher, nearly 6 percent of all licensed family homes
- 78,000 children were participating in Early Achievers enrolled programs as of December 31, 2015, 90 percent of the original RTT-ELC target for children reached.
- 372 Early Childhood and Education Assistance Program (ECEAP) providers are participating in Early Achievers, or 71 percent of the total. 136 ECEAP sites have completed the rating and 95 percent (129) attained a Level 4 or 5.

#### Challenges and Lessons Learned

- ECEAP providers are required by the Early Start Act to attain an Early Achievers quality Level 4 by March 31, 2016. DEL is working to make sure that the capacity is available to support all ECEAP providers to meet this deadline.

### Project 3: TQRIS Infrastructure

Development of the support structure for Early Achievers has been enhanced in Year 4 of the RTT-ELC grant.

### Accomplishments

- **Child Care Quality Baseline (CCQB):** CCQBs were developed as a tool to help provide a bridge between the Level 2 activities and the rating process. CCQBs were developed and piloted in the winter of 2014, and Child Care Aware of Washington has worked to increase its capacity to offer CCQBs to all providers that want to access the services. While the CCQBs were launched in 2014, most providers rated prior to 2015 did not yet have access to this tool so 2015 was the year this tool was scaled statewide.

- **Modification to the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS) Thresholds and Supports:** Ensuring that the ERS support the quality improvement work in Washington includes some changes in the use of the tool, including:

Reduction in ERS Threshold: a decision was made to lower the threshold to a 3.0 on July 1, 2015, allowing providers continuous, active engagement in quality improvement efforts, and providing the state with an opportunity to establish a flexible progression-based practice of defining quality.

ERS Support Services: Technical Assistance Specialists and Coaches in each region have achieved high levels of reliability and participated in an ERS “Train the Trainer” sessions adding capacity to train others to reliability in each of the 3 ERS measures used in Early Achievers.

- **Increased Focus on Serving Diverse Providers:** Ensuring that Early Achievers is culturally and linguistically relevant and serves diverse communities well was a priority for 2015, including:

Staff Composition: Of the 78 coaches and technical assistance specialists, 35 (34 percent) speak other languages in addition to English including Spanish, Somali, Russian, Vietnamese, Swahili, Tagalog, Hindi, and Arabic. The data collection team includes Spanish, Korean, Vietnamese, Somali, Cantonese, English, Mandarin, Arabic, and American Sign Language speakers.

Regional Customization: Flexibility has been increased to allow for tailored services for unique regional populations, such as specific communities or language groups. For example, work is being done to allow customization of services to meet the needs of Tribal Governments. DEL is in the process of developing a 'participation agreement' that is appropriate for the government to government relationship that DEL has with each Tribal government. DEL QRIS and Tribal Liaison staffs are working in partnership with the University of Washington and have extended an open invitation to Tribal governments to review alternative assessments for QRIS. DEL is also in the process of reviewing how other states have worked in partnership with Tribal governments within their QRIS and are in the process of scheduling a peer call, facilitated by the National Center on Early Childhood Quality Assurance.

Training Enhancements: The Child Care Aware Professional Development Academy and Level 2 trainings have been held in Spanish and Somali, and Child Care Aware of Washington staff makes accommodations to the those who cannot attend an on-line training by providing non-technology based “in-person” versions of the training which this can be delivered in multiple languages, as well as group trainings in community-hosted computer labs.

Early Achievers Institutes: Sessions and handouts are available in English, Spanish, and Somali and interpretation services are available for all keynote presentations. Additionally, upon registration, participants can request language services in any language they choose and an interpreter will be provided to them at the institute. Bi-lingual staff do direct outreach with Spanish and Somali language providers, assisting them in the registration process and providing support at the institutes.

- **Free Re-Rating:** In addition to the initial free rating, Early Achievers participants that provide Head Start, ECEAP, or Working Connections Child Care (WCCC) subsidy services are now eligible for one free re-rate if they do not achieve the required quality rating level on their initial rating. This includes licensed child care sites that must attain Level 4 rating to provide ECEAP.
- **Early Achievers Institutes:** Begun in 2013, the Institutes have been held 10 times across the state and have been attended by 2,360 participants (English 1,940; Spanish 361; Somali 59). Over the last three years, the institutes have expanded their scope to include greater language diversity in sessions and a stronger focus on supporting children with special needs. Highlights include the development of a full training series in Spanish and Somali, with multiple sessions addressing high quality interactions (CLASS focus) and environments (ERS focus).

### Challenges and Lessons Learned

- The Early Start Act requirements for participation and quality attainment are pushing the existing capacity in the system. Discussions are currently in progress to make sure that Early Achievers has the supports to assist providers to meet



the new requirements.

- Existing ECEAP providers are required to attain a Level 4 in Early Achievers by March of 2016. This fast-paced timeline has been a barrier for some providers. Discussions are happening to make sure that this requirement will be met.

#### **Project 4: Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS) - Kindergarten Readiness**

WaKIDS, a key reform area, reached over half of Kindergarteners in the state, implementing the three elements of the Kindergarten transition: 1) a whole child assessment using Teaching Strategies GOLD, 2) a family connection between teachers and parents, and 3) an Early Learning Collaboration between schools, districts, and regional levels between early learning providers and kindergarten teachers and school principals.

##### **Accomplishments**

- Washington uses Teaching Strategies GOLD® as its Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA), and in 2015 assessed 58,656 kindergartners, reaching 74 percent of the state's kindergartners. Nearly 100 percent participation is anticipated in the 2016-17 school year.
- The number of schools participating in WaKIDS grew from 623 to 887 in 2015, and the number of districts increased from 193 to 257. Teacher participation in WaKIDS increased from 2,110 to 2,974.
- 1,280 teachers new to WaKIDS were trained in 2015. In addition, 164 teachers returning to WaKIDS attended a second training opportunity to deepen their understanding, bringing the total number of teachers trained in 2015 to 1,444.

##### **Challenges**

- Continued roll out of full-day Kindergarten across the state has meant continued rapid expansion of WaKIDS.

#### **Project 5: Professional Development**

Professional Development capacity has continued to be built in 2015.

##### **Accomplishments**

- More than 2,994 facility administrators have completed Strengthening Families training.
- 10,995 professionals completed the Early Learning Guidelines training.
- In fall of 2015, DEL in partnership with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) developed a career planning portal that serves as a web based guide for career planning. The career planning portal allows students the opportunity to explore career options in early learning, roles, qualifications and desirable degrees.

##### **Challenges**

- Continuing to build capacity in higher education to provide the degree attainment that supports higher levels of quality.
- Ensuring the training capacity to meet the Early Start Act participation and quality attain requirements.
- Having the data systems necessary to support the implementation of the Early Start Act.

**Looking Ahead:** As the RTT-ELC grant concludes, responsibility for sustaining this work has shifted to the state. Washington will continue to expand and enhance this work with state funding, including:

- Creating an aligned set of standards for licensing, Early Achievers and ECEAP.
- Reassess the strengths and opportunities to continue to scale Early Achievers.
- Assess the ratings process looking for opportunities to streamline and simplify.
- Continue to expand WaKIDS to all schools and reach nearly 100 percent of children.

- Continued improvements of the data systems needed to support the work at scale.
- Exploring the use of alternative quality assessment tools that meet the culturally specific needs of the federally recognized tribes in Washington State.



## 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).

Over the fourth year of the grant, Washington's RTT-ELC governance structure has not changed significantly; however, it has continued to evolve.

#### Washington State's Key RTT-ELC Governance Stakeholders

Department of Early Learning (DEL): As the lead agency for this grant, DEL leads implementation and provides oversight of the state's grant work plan, with newly appointed DEL Director, Ross Hunter, as the grant's Project Director and DEL Assistant Director for Quality Practice and Professional Growth, Nicole Rose, as the grant Initiative Sponsor and lead for grant program delivery. The continued success of the grant is reflective of the strong leadership and collaborative engagement style employed by these two individuals and of other key stakeholders guiding grant program delivery. As part of the agency's internal governance processes, Assistant Director Rose provides regular updates to DEL's Leadership Team and engages them in the full integration of Early Achievers, the state's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS), into the State's early learning system. In addition, Director Hunter and his staff provide regular updates on Washington's improvements in early learning to the Governor, Legislature, executive and legislative staffs, the Early Learning Advisory Council, and the public.

State Early Learning Leadership Team ("Washington Early Learning Partnership"): Leaders from DEL, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), and Thrive Washington (Thrive) continue to participate in the Washington Early Learning Partnership that leads the state's early learning system building. Leaders from the Department of Health (DOH) and the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) have recently joined the partnership. The Early Learning State Leadership Team meets monthly and has served as a strategic advisory body to the RTT-ELC initiative.

Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC): The Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) continues to provide overarching guidance to DEL's implementation of the state's early learning plan and brings broad and diverse representation to the quarterly ELAC meetings. ELAC serves as an advisory body to the RTT-ELC initiative, and provides input to and feedback on early learning operational activities in the state. In 2013, Regional Advisors were added as non-voting members to the ELAC structure. Regional Advisors represent community leaders from the 10 Early Learning Regional Coalitions (ELRC) in Washington. In July of 2015, the Early Start Act required a subcommittee to provide feedback and guidance on Early Achievers. This subcommittee is called the Early Achievers Review Subcommittee.

RTT-ELC Key Implementation Partners: DEL has established partnerships in Washington's early learning community to guide implementation of grant activities. DEL maintains performance-focused contractual relationships with these partners, including Child Care Aware of Washington (CCA of WA), the University of Washington (UW), OSPI, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), Thrive, and the Washington State Association of Head Start and ECEAP (WSA).

#### 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.

During 2015, Washington State continued to make progress in its efforts to gain broad representation and involve key stakeholders in the state's early learning community in carrying out the activities of the grant.

ELAC carries out required state council functions in Head Start law and provides strategic guidance and feedback to DEL on

the RTT-ELC grant. It includes membership from key constituents that represent statewide and community-based interests and perspectives including: state agencies, early learning leaders, Thrive, parents, Head Start representatives, and a representative for programs under 619 of Part C of the Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). In addition to ELAC, DEL has other ways to solicit and use parent input in shaping programs and policies and informing continued work of the RTT-ELC grant, including:

Early Achievers Review Subcommittee: The 2015 Washington Legislature charged ELAC and DEL with convening an Early Achievers Review Subcommittee to provide feedback and guidance on strategies to improve the quality of instruction and environment for early learning and provide input and recommendations on the implementation and refinement of Early Achievers. The subcommittee uses a racial equity lens and considers cultural and linguistic responsiveness as key parts of their analysis. The subcommittee includes representatives from family home child care, child care centers, ECEAP, Early Achievers partners, and parents accessing child care subsidies.

Survey and Focus Groups on Preschool Expansion: The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, in association with Thrive and the ten Regional Early Learning Coalitions, held ten focus groups and conducted a survey of 80 preschool providers across the state with ECEAP, Head Start, preschool, and other early learning providers to discuss and gather input on the expansion of high-quality preschool services. The purpose of these focus groups is to help assess the current capacity and resources needed to expand publicly funded preschool in Washington.

Parent Advisory Group (PAG): The PAG serves as a sounding board for decisions, ideas, and questions that shape the future of DEL. Regionally represented parent advisors meet with DEL leadership, Parent Advisory Councils at local ECEAP and Head Start programs, and a Parent Advisory Council for statewide IDEA, Part C services.

Parent Navigators: DEL contracts with WSA to bring together a group of parents who train other parents on quality care and education, Early Achievers, and the Washington State Early Learning and Development Guidelines in peer-to-peer networks. What DEL learns from this work with Parent Navigators about effective outreach will inform future outreach and communication with parents and families.

Early Learning Regional Coalitions (ELRC): DEL and Thrive support 10 early learning coalitions around the state that recruit early learning providers, parents, and community stakeholders to build local capacity, and assist with implementation of community-based components of RTT-ELC. For example, DEL provides funding to the local coalitions to support the bridge between early learning and the K-12 system that is part of WaKIDS. DEL has recently expanded membership of ELAC to include members of the 10 ELRCs.

Town Hall Meetings: DEL staff hosted seven town hall style meetings across the state. Early Achievers participants and stakeholders were invited to hear a brief update on RTT-ELC progress, proposed improvements to Early Achievers, and state-funded preschool expansion. After the presentation participants worked in small groups to provide feedback based on their experiences with Early Achievers. During these sessions participants highlighted the challenges and successes they have faced and proposed possible solutions. These sessions were well attended and reached anywhere between 20 and 50 participants per session.

Regional Relationship Based Professional Development (RBPD) Meetings: Regional CCA of WA agencies hosted an ongoing series of RBPD meetings where coaches, technical assistance specialists, rating readiness consultants, Infant/Toddler Coaches, ECEAP funded coaches, mental health specialists, and professionals from other disciplines came together to discuss how their work intersects and different ways to coordinate and collaborate with one another in the work to support Early Achievers participants. During this past year the focus has been on establishing relationships with one another and understanding the roles and responsibilities of each party. As the regional groups mature the goal is to see a case consultation model emerge.

Standards Alignment Project: DEL launched a major initiative in 2015 to align child care licensing regulations and ECEAP standards under the Early Achievers quality framework. The goal of this work is to have a clear set of early learning standards that are relevant to all early care and education programs in the state. DEL is partnering with early learning regional coalitions to co-facilitate community input sessions across the state. The Standards Alignment Community Input process included 22 community input meetings in different regions and communities of our state. More than 650 early learning educators representing different services, programs and organizations provided DEL with valuable input, which will be used to generate the first draft of aligned standards. DEL plans to submit a final draft of aligned standards to their governor's office and the legislature by November 2016.

Indian Policy Early Learning Committee (IPEL): DEL has been meeting quarterly with representatives from various federally recognized tribes in Washington to address the inclusion and consideration of tribes within the context of the early learning system. The objective of IPEL is to assist the collective needs of the Tribal governments with other American Indian organizations to assure quality and comprehensive service delivery to all American Indians and Alaska Natives in

Washington State. Long range, IPEL will combine its work with a larger birth through higher education Tribal Education Enterprise Committee.

Most recently, IPEL has provided feedback on the extension and exception protocol for Early Achievers participants. This protocol provides guidance for situations when an Early Achievers participant has experienced exceptional circumstances and may need an extension on their mandated rating timelines. IPEL was able to offer critical feedback regarding the circumstances that may warrant an extension, including seasonal cultural practices and changes in Tribal leadership, not just leadership at the early learning program level. The group will continue to address barriers to participation in Early Achievers and cultural considerations within the Early Achievers Quality Framework.

### **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.

In July of 2015, the Washington State Legislature passed the Early Start Act (ESA). This piece of landmark legislation makes a record investment in early learning, sustains funding to Early Achievers, and provides resources and guidance to help improve Early Achievers for low-income and culturally diverse providers. In addition to providing funding and guidance resources, the ESA includes an Early Achievers participation mandate for state funded preschool providers and providers who serve children on Working Connections Child Care (WCCC) Subsidies.

Passage of the Early Start Act was possible because of a decade long focus on early learning in Washington. As the first state in the nation to have a cabinet-level Department of Early Learning, Washington has been focused on early learning as an integral part of the state's education system. In 2010, hundreds of early learning leaders from across the state came together to develop the Washington Early Learning Plan, a 10-year road map for building an early learning system that supports children and families to be healthy and ready for school success.

In 2011, Washington used the Early Learning Plan as the base to win a \$60 million federal Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant. This grant provided the resources to scale and test many of the systems necessary to support high-quality early learning, including Early Achievers, Washington's tiered quality rating and improvement system, and WaKIDS, Washington's kindergarten transition process, as well as strengthening the state's early learning professional development and data systems. The Early Start Act allows Washington to build and improve upon this work, using important lessons learned to further refine the early learning systems for the children and families in Washington.

The investment from the Early Start Act will help DEL continue the progress started with the RTT-ELC. The Early Start Act established an Early Achievers Review Subcommittee to our Early Learning Advisory Council. This subcommittee is responsible for reviewing all significant policy changes to Early Achievers and producing an annual report to the Legislature. The first annual report was submitted in December of 2015 and included a comprehensive overview of the efforts that have been made to date with RTT-ELC funds. The involvement of the subcommittee will help DEL engage in continuous quality improvement of Early Achievers while maintaining a focus on the unique needs of low income and culturally diverse providers across the state.

### **Participating State Agencies**

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

There have been no significant changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in the Washington State Plan. Over the fourth year of the RTT-ELC grant, implementation refinements continue to ensure project delivery is optimally aligned with the organizations or organizational units best suited to support the delivery of work plan activities and deliverables.

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.

By the fourth year of the grant, Washington's TQRIS, Early Achievers, began to add new processes and requirements at all levels. Early Achievers scaled very quickly and some of the initial program elements were shown to not be effective during the rapid implementation. A culture of learning, assessing, and using data to inform decisions has been built over the initial implementation period amongst all of the partners leading the work. As a result, the Early Achievers quality framework has been modified and improved. The expectation is that Early Achievers will continue to learn and adapt as more information and data becomes available about what works to improve quality and is tied to improving child outcomes. Key policy and program modifications that were made to Early Achievers are as follows:

Child Care Quality Baseline (CCQB): The CCQB, a pre-rating formative assessment is offered to providers prior to rating to ensure that providers are ready to rate before moving through the process. This assessment was developed in response to the data that was received after initial statewide rating outcomes were analyzed. It was clear that there was a need for providers and coaches to have a better sense of the strengths and areas for growth prior to going through the actual rating process. Rated providers expressed that they did not understand why they received the scores they did on ERS and CLASS after the rating. The CCQB provides additional data upfront; CCQBs were developed as a tool to help provide a bridge between the Level 2 activities and the rating process. The assessments were piloted in the winter of 2014, and CCA of WA has worked to increase its capacity to offer CCQBs to all providers that want to access the services. Feedback on the CCQB has been positive from both providers and Early Achievers staff. Most providers rated prior to 2015 did not yet have access to this tool. In 2015, the CCQB tool was scaled statewide.

Modification to the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS): The ERS are the most commonly used quality assessment nationally for early learning. Ensuring that the ERS support the quality improvement work in Washington requires assessing the tool's capacity to support quality improvement efforts statewide, and make modifications when necessary, including:

Reduction in ERS Threshold: Early Achievers initially required a minimum rating of a 3.5 on the ERS to achieve a rating of high-quality (Level 3-5). Through the initial years of implementation, the ERS threshold was established without a solid understanding of the state-wide baseline of quality. Developing a shared understanding of the ERS and its connection to quality improvements has been necessary. In order to support the development of a shared understanding of the importance of environment and process quality improvements, a decision was made to lower the threshold to a 3.0 on July 1, 2015, allowing providers continuous, active engagement in quality improvement efforts, and providing the state with an opportunity to establish a flexible progression-based practice of defining quality. After reducing the ERS minimum threshold to 3.0, 88 providers that were originally rated a Level 2 were reclassified as Level 3 or higher as a result of this change. The percent of providers, including ECEAP, that achieved a rating of Level 3 or higher increased from 68 percent to 84 percent, which represents a more current quality baseline for environmental and process quality in Washington.

ERS Support Services: Initial ratings showed that ERS was proving to be a barrier for providers and few CCA of WA staff were reliable on ERS to assist providers with interpreting ERS data and preparing programs for ratings. Child Care Aware of Washington responded by focusing on building regional expertise on the ERS. Technical Assistance Specialists and Coaches in each region have achieved high levels of reliability and participated in ERS "Train the Trainer" sessions adding capacity to train others to reliability in each of the three ERS measures used in Early Achievers. This has built local capacity and bolstered the confidence of coaches and TA Specialists to assist providers. While regional needs on the ERS differ, each region now has the capacity to provide ERS expertise. The increased capacity to support the ERS has had a statewide impact, and includes all of the ERS measures, including the Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale (ITERS-R), the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale (ECERS-R) and the Family Child Care Environmental Rating Scale (FCCERS-R).

Increased Focus on Serving Diverse Providers: Ensuring that Early Achievers is culturally and linguistically relevant and serves diverse communities well is both a priority and has been an area for growth and development since inception. Initial feedback highlighted that Early Achievers participation was difficult for some providers. Improvements to Early Achievers were made, ensuring that all providers, particularly providers who speak languages other than English, have the supports they need to enhance a quality of their services.

Improvements to the supports for these providers in Early Achievers include:

Staff Composition: Technical Assistance Specialists and Coaches reflect community diversity in staff composition and

culturally competent practices. Of the 78 coaches and technical assistance specialists, 35 (34 percent) speak other languages in addition to English including Spanish, Somali, Russian, Vietnamese, Swahili, Tagalog, Hindi, and Arabic.

Regional Customization: Flexibility has been increased to allow for tailored services for unique regional populations, such as specific communities or language groups. Regions with high language diversity have the highest percentage of bilingual staff, including Central (10 out of 12 staff bilingual in Spanish) and King (9 out of 26 staff bilingual in one or more of the above languages).

Bilingual Rating Data Collection: There are 12 bilingual rating Data Collectors who speak Spanish, Vietnamese, Somali, Cantonese, Mandarin, Russian, Arabic and American Sign Language as well as English. Data collection in these sites is done with an interpreter. The interpreter and the data collector wear a device that allows the interpreter process the information and speak it to the data collector in an ear piece, this is done in real time.

Training Enhancements: The Child Care Aware Professional Development Academy and Level 2 trainings have been held in Spanish and Somali, and Child Care Aware of Washington staff makes accommodations to the online trainings by providing them in-person.

Early Achievers Institutes: New training institutes were created to provide additional support on the Early Achievers Standards to participants, with sessions ranging from improving instructional support to incorporating developmental screenings. Begun in 2013, the Institutes have been held 10 times across the state and have been attended by 2,360 participants (English 1,940; Spanish 361; Somali 59). Sessions and handouts are available in English, Spanish and Somali and interpretation services are available for all keynote presentations. Additionally, upon registration, participants can request language services in any language they choose and an interpreter will be provided to them at the institute. Bi-lingual staff do direct outreach with Spanish and Somali language providers, assisting them in the registration process and providing support at the institutes.

Over the last three years, the institutes have expanded their scope to include greater language diversity in sessions and a stronger focus on supporting children with special needs. Highlights include the development of a full training series in Spanish and Somali, with multiple sessions addressing high quality interactions (CLASS focus) and environments (ERS focus). Additionally, through a partnership with the UW Haring Center, sessions like "Leadership for Inclusion" and "Individualized Teaching and Learning," as well as panel discussions and key notes presentations, have raised awareness about the why and how of creating inclusive early education settings.

The institutes offer one-day "deep dive" trainings on the ECERS-R, ITERS-R, and FCCERS-R, which have been attended by 561 participants. CLASS reliability training is also provided at the institutes, and, to date, 276 participants have attended the two day CLASS reliability training at Early Achievers institutes. The most popular institute sessions are "Teach Me What to Do Instead," "Maximizing Learning Time," "ECERS," and now the "Creative Curriculum," offered for the first time at the November 2015 Everett Early Achievers institute.

Children with Special Needs: Based on feedback from the field, the Haring Center at UW is providing training to Early Achievers coaches on supporting children with special needs. Additionally, while the Early Achievers quality standards don't specifically call out children with disabilities, this information is captured in several ways:

- Individualized instruction: How are the teachers meeting the unique needs of each child.
- Screening and Assessment: These two standards help to identify needs and to track development over time and that the information collected in the assessment is used to inform instruction.
- ERS: There are specific indicators in the tool that measure quality for children with special needs.
- Partnering with families: In Child Outcomes and in the Family Engagement standards we expect to see providers connecting with families to share screening and assessment information, to have conferences, to learn the strengths and needs of the child based on family input and to provide supports to children and families as they transition from class to class or from the program to kindergarten (or another early learning setting).

Standards Alignment Project: DEL launched a major initiative in 2015 to ensure clear progression of alignment between its licensing regulations, Early Achievers quality standards, and ECEAP, the comprehensive, state-funded preschool. The goal of this work is to have a clear set of early learning standards that are relevant to all early care and education programs in



the state, and that show a demonstrable progression of quality improvement through the different levels. Early Achievers is the quality framework for the standards alignment project, and every licensing rule and ECEAP performance standard is being assessed and evaluated within this context. Recommendations are due to the Governor and legislature by November of 2016. DEL expects to launch a single set of comprehensive, aligned standards in July of 2017.

### **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.

Research clearly demonstrates that the quality of early learning environments is critical to supporting child growth and development, and that children need access to high quality programs, stability of participation in these programs, and increased duration (i.e. "dosage"). The Early Start Act responded to this need by providing supports to help existing early learning providers offer a level of quality that will promote strong child outcomes, mandating levels of quality for providers that accept children on WCCC subsidy or Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) funding, and focusing on improving quality for children most at-risk for not being ready for Kindergarten. The Early Start Act highlights several key goals:

1. Create a child-focused system that supports high-quality services that will improve child outcomes and prioritize early learning services to children that need them most,
2. Build upon and strengthen the existing system by making sure it is accessible to all children, families, and providers in Washington,
3. Use data to drive ongoing policy and programmatic decisions, and
4. Ensure programs are seamless for families, particularly child care and preschool, and working together to promote high-quality, efficiently managed services.

The Early Start Act is focused on improving the quality and scale of early learning programs in Washington in order to improve school readiness for children. In order to achieve these goals, the Early Start Act developed key, achievable targets that will increase access to high quality early learning opportunities to the children most likely to benefit. Targets set by the Early Start Act include:

- All licensed child care providers serving non-school age children on subsidy will rate an Early Achievers Level 3-5 by December of 2019 or complete remedial activities by 2020;
- All existing ECEAP providers will rate an Early Achievers Level 4-5 by March 2016 or rate a Level 4 within six months of beginning remedial activities;
- ECEAP will be available to all eligible children by the 2020-21 school year
- Providers at Early Achievers Levels 3-5 will be eligible to receive contracted child care slots;
- ECEAP providers will offer part day, full school day, and extended day models according to demand for services and availability of supply;
- DEL will develop a single set of standards across licensing and ECEAP using Early Achievers as the framework for quality;
- DEL will implement a 12-month authorization for Working Connections Child Care to promote stability and high-quality for low-income children; and
- DEL will create assurances that early learning programs are available, supported and appropriate for low-income and

diverse communities across the state, and that there aren't barriers to participation.

The passage of the Early Start Act significantly impacts future participation in Early Achievers as it is no longer a voluntary program for providers that accept children on subsidy. Participation in Early Achievers has grown steadily since it was launched in July 2012, and as of December 31, 2015, 2,428 licensed providers were participating representing 46.9 percent of licensed family homes and centers in Washington. Participation in Early Achievers continues to be higher by child care centers, with 61.6 percent participation. Family home participation is lower at 40.9 percent of licensed family homes participating. DEL recently collaborated with the family child care union, SEIU, and Child Care Aware of Washington on an outreach plan to increase licensed family home child care participation in Early Achievers.

**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	260	100%	260	100%	260	100%	260	100%	260	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	415	100%	415	100%	415	100%	415	100%	415	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	4,718	100%	4,718	100%	4,718	100%	4,718	100%	4,718	100%
Other 1	1,567	100%	1,567	100%	1,567	100%	1,567	100%	1,567	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Licensed Child Care Centers									
Other 2	5,164	100%	5,164	100%	5,164	100%	5,164	100%	5,164	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Licensed Family Child Care Homes									
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	260	260	100%	260	260	100%	260	260	100%	260	260	100%	260	260	100%
<i>Specify:</i>	ECEAP														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	415	415	100%	415	415	100%	415	415	100%	415	415	100%	415	415	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619															
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	4,718	4,718	100%	4,718	4,718	100%	4,718	4,718	100%	4,718	4,718	100%	4,718	4,718	100%
Other 1	1,567	1,567	100%	1,567	1,567	100%	1,567	1,567	100%	1,567	1,567	100%	1,567	1,567	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Licensed Child Care Centers														
Other 2	5,164	5,164	100%	5,164	5,164	100%	5,164	5,164	100%	5,164	5,164	100%	5,164	5,164	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Licensed Family Child Care Homes														
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.

Data provided from DEL's Early Learning Management System (ELMS). This figure represents the number of ECEAP sites. The actual number of ECEAP sites in SFY 2011-2012 was 265. The actual number of ECEAP sites in SFY 2012-2013 is 266. The actual number of ECEAP sites in SFY 2013-2014 is 279. The actual number of ECEAP sites in SFY 2014-2015 is 324. Targets are based on data provided from by the Washington Head Start State Collaboration Office (HSSCO) for the RTT-ELC application. This figure represents the number of Early Head Start/Head Start, Migrant and Seasonal, and American Indian/Alaskan Native programs in Washington State as reported by the HSSCO.

DEL is working with IDEA Part C to establish an agreement to promote TQRIS. Currently, the majority of IDEA Part C programs are home-based and therefore do not fit within the model outlined in the TQRIS Standards.

Classes for children funded by Part B are operated by school districts not licensed by DEL and so cannot participate in TQRIS. As indicated in our MOU, OSPI and DEL have begun to discuss development of a work plan to integrate classes serving children under Part B into TQRIS as appropriate. Classrooms that serve both ECEAP and Part B children are required to participate in Early Achievers as part of the Early Start Act.

DEL is working with OSPI (Title I) to establish an agreement to understand and promote connections between Title I and TQRIS. Currently, Title I expenditures on preschool would be captured in data for ECEAP, Head Start, and licensed child care centers. DEL and OSPI will work to breakout this data in future years.

In 2012, approximately 77 percent of licensed child care centers and 68 percent of licensed family home child care programs receive subsidies for child care. This data comes from the Washington State Child Care Survey, published by Washington State University's Social and Economic Sciences Research Center bi-annually. 2010 survey data were used because at the time, the most recent 2012 update was just recently published and the data were not available to support this analysis. These percentages are applied to the total number of licensed child care centers and family home child care to determine the number of subsidized facilities. The total subsidized facilities based on active licensed facilities as of 12/31/2012 is 4,163. Calculations are shown below:

*Please See Supplementary Data Notes for relevant table.*

In 2013, approximately 79 percent of licensed child care centers and 63 percent of licensed family home child care programs receive subsidies for child care. This data comes from the Washington State Child Care Survey, published by Washington State University's Social and Economic Sciences Research Center bi-annually. 2012 survey data were used for 2013 #s. These percentages are applied to the total number of licensed centers and family homes to determine the number of subsidized facilities. The total subsidized facilities based on active licensed facilities as of 12/31/2013 is 3,696. Calculations are shown below:

*Please See Supplementary Data Notes for relevant table.*

In 2014, approximately 79 percent of licensed child care centers and 63 percent of licensed family home child care programs receive subsidies for child care. This data comes from the Washington State Child Care Survey, published by Washington State University's Social and Economic Sciences Research Center bi-annually. 2012 survey data were used for 2014 #s. These percentages are applied to the total number of licensed centers and family homes to determine the number of subsidized facilities. The total subsidized facilities based on active licensed facilities as of 12/31/2014 is 3,609. Calculations are shown below:

*Please See Supplementary Data Notes for relevant table.*

### **2015 Data Notes:**

In 2015, approximately 79.4 percent of licensed child care centers and 61.8 percent of licensed family home child care programs received subsidies for child care. This data comes from the Washington State Child Care Survey, published by Washington State University's Social and Economic Sciences Research Center bi-annually. 2014 survey data were used for 2015 #s. These percentages are applied to the total number of licensed child care centers and family homes to determine the number of subsidized facilities. The total subsidized facilities based on active licensed facilities as of 12/31/2015 is 3,461.

*Please See Supplementary Data Notes for relevant table.*

Target and actual data provided by DEL from the FAMLINK database, the State Child Welfare Information System. The actual number of licensed child care centers as of December 31, 2012 was 1,553. This number includes all active licensed



child care providers (except for school-age program facilities), and includes those that are licensed, licensed-certified, and/or payment only. This number includes government, military, and DEL licensing authorities.

The actual number of licensed child care centers as of December 31, 2013 was 1,477. This number includes all active licensed child care providers (except for school-age program facilities), and includes those that are licensed, licensed-certified, and/or payment only. This number includes government, military, and DEL licensing authorities.

The actual number of licensed child care centers as of December 31, 2014 was 1,486. This number includes all active licensed child care providers (except for school-age program facilities), and includes those that are licensed, licensed-certified, and/or payment only. This number includes government, military, and DEL licensing authorities.

**2015 Data Notes:**

The actual number of licensed child care centers as of December 31, 2015 was 1,496. This number includes all active licensed child care providers (except for school-age only facilities), and includes those that are licensed, licensed-certified, and/or payment only. This number includes government, military, and DEL licensing authorities.

Target and actual data provided by DEL from the FAMLINK database, the State Child Welfare Information System. The actual number of licensed family home child care programs as of December 31, 2012 was 4,363. This number includes all active licensed child care providers (except for school-age program facilities), and includes those that are licensed, licensed-certified, and/or payment only. This number includes government, military, and DEL licensing authorities.

The actual data provided by DEL from the FAMLINK database, the State Child Welfare Information System. The actual number of licensed family home child care programs as of December 31, 2013 was 3,989. This number includes all active licensed child care providers (except for school-age program facilities), and includes those that are licensed, licensed-certified, and/or payment only. This number includes government, military, and DEL licensing authorities.

The actual data provided by DEL from the FAMLINK database, the State Child Welfare Information System. The actual number of licensed family home child care programs as of December 31, 2014 was 3,840. This number includes all active licensed child care providers (except for school-age program facilities), and includes those that are licensed, licensed-certified, and/or payment only. This number includes government, military, and DEL licensing authorities.

**2015 Data Notes:**

The actual data is provided by DEL from the FAMLINK database, the State Child Welfare Information System. The actual number of licensed family home child care programs as of December 31, 2015 was 3,678. This number includes all active licensed child care providers (except for school-age program facilities), and includes those that are licensed, licensed-certified, and/or payment only. This number includes government, military, and DEL licensing authorities.

**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.

While Washington is under our RTT-ELC target for the number of providers, we are very close to our original RTT-ELC targets in the number of children that are being served by Early Achievers participants with over 78,000 children enrolled in programs participating in Early Achievers as of December 31, 2015. This is 90 percent of the original RTT-ELC target for children reached and is explained by the high participation of child care centers and ECEAP sites.

372 ECEAP providers are participating in Early Achievers, or 71 percent of the total. These existing ECEAP providers are required by the Early Start Act to attain an Early Achievers quality Level 4 by March 31, 2016 and DEL is working closely with all ECEAP providers to ensure that they are able to make this deadline. New ECEAP sites have a longer timeline to achieve this quality standard.

Expectations are that participation rates will significantly increase over the next several years as the Early Start Act mandates take effect.

**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.

Data collectors at the University of Washington's Child Care Quality and Early Learning Center for Research and Professional Development (CQEL) are a diverse group of professionals who represent the community, and have been trained on multiple assessments. The UW data collection team consists of one part-time employee and 19 full-time employees. Data collectors are hired, supervised, and mentored from the CQEL central location in Seattle, but live and work throughout the state. This regional model helps keep costs low and ensures some cultural congruency between data collectors and programs. Languages spoken by our data collection team include: Spanish, Vietnamese, Somali, Cantonese, Mandarin, Russian, Arabic and American Sign Language as well as English. In 2015 the team collected data for 357 facilities or homes.

After establishing initial reliability on an instrument, data collectors are monitored in a live coding environment every 11th assessment, or once per month, depending on the volume of assessments being conducted. The CQEL team includes an assessment lead (supervisor) to manage data collection and reliability for the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS); and an assessment lead (supervisor) for the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). The assessment lead is responsible for managing the reliability. Stringent monitoring and feedback practices put in place for the data collection team result in reliability levels higher than the levels recommended by the assessment developers. Assessment leads are checked once per year by the instrument authors. ERS average inter-rater reliability is currently at 93.02 percent. Class reliability (across all measures and team members) is currently at 91.6 percent. The assessment leads and other select staff participate in annual reliability training with the authors from ERSI to strategically plan for reliability checking in the following year.

**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.

2015 saw a significant increase in early care and education settings that were attaining higher levels of quality in Early Achievers. As of December 31, 2015, 565 licensed child care and family home child care programs were rated at a level 3, 4, or 5 as follows:

Child Care Centers: 404 child care centers completed the rating process and 88.1 percent (356) attained a Level 3 or higher.

Family Home Child Care: 276 family home child care facilities completed the rating process and 75.7 percent (209) attained a Level 3 or higher.

11 percent of all licensed child care centers and family homes in Washington are rated at a Level 3 or higher, and nearly a quarter (23 percent) of Early Achievers participants are rated at a Level 3 or higher. 23 percent of all child care centers in Washington are rated at a Level 3 or higher, and **38.6** percent of child care providers that are participating in Early Achievers are rated a Level 3 or higher.

ECEAP also saw an increase in the number of sites rated at Level 4 or higher (ECEAP providers are required to attain a Level 4.) 136 ECEAP sites have completed the rating and 95 percent (129) attained a Level 4 or 5. This number is expected to increase significantly in the first half of 2016 as the remaining ECEAP sites are required by the Early Start Act to go through the rating process and rate by March 31, 2016.

There are several key strategies that have been used to increase the number of providers that are rating at higher tiers of quality.

**Incentives:**

Quality Improvement Award: Quality Improvement Awards are annual cash awards provided to participating child care centers that achieve rating Levels 3 through 5 and participating family home child care programs that achieve rating Levels 2 through 5. Per the Early Start Act, Quality Improvement Awards are reserved for participants offering programs to an enrollment population consisting of at least five percent of children receiving a state subsidy. Quality Improvement (QI) Awards recognize achievement and support facilities to implement and meet on-going quality improvement goals.

Tiered Reimbursement: Tiered Reimbursement is a tool to support the cost of quality above the basic base rate paid for children on subsidy. In addition to a recent 10 percent increases in the base rate<sup>(1)</sup>, providers enrolled in Early Achievers receive a 2 percent increase in the subsidy base rate. These providers are expected to advance to a rated level of 3 or higher within 30 months of enrolling in Early Achievers. Facilities who receive a Level 3 through 5 rating are eligible to earn an additional increase to the subsidy base rate as follows:

Level 3: 4 percent above the base rate

Level 4: 10 percent above the base rate

Level 5: 15 percent above the base rate

Needs-Based Grants: Prior to and throughout 2015, family home child care and child care centers participating in Early Achievers have been eligible to receive a Needs-Based Grant of \$500 to \$1,000 for the purpose of improving scores on the Environment Rating Scales (ERS). The facility works with their Technical Assistance Specialist or Coach to prepare and submit a Needs-Based Grant Proposed Spending Plan and Submission Form. Grant funds may be used for:

- Purchasing items such as books, science materials, and gross motor equipment
- Substitute time
- Other items identified by the Technical Assistance Specialist or Coach

Level 2 Quality Improvement Awards: Funding is available to family home child care providers that rate at a Level 2, in addition to existing awards for providers that rate at a Level 3-5. This money can be used to enhance a provider's ability to achieve a Level 3 in the next rating. Providers work with their coach to set goals, and discuss how to spend the funds most effectively.

Free Re-Rating: In addition to the initial free rating, Early Achievers participants that provide Head Start, ECEAP or WCCC subsidy services are now eligible for one free re-rate if they do not achieve the required quality rating level on their initial rating. This includes licensed child care sites that must attain a Level 4 rating to provide ECEAP. This free re-rate option is currently available to help Early Achievers participants meet their Early Start Act rating timeline requirement, and is available once per three-year rating cycle. The re-rate will only cover the area(s) in which the facility did not achieve the minimum threshold for the required quality level rating. For example, the re-rate may only include the Environment Rating Scale (ERS) or Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) assessments. No additional facility information will be considered.

As of October 15, 2015, 126 licensed child care providers achieved a rating of Level 2. 73 of these providers have been re-rated and, of these, 62 providers (85 percent) attained a Level 3 or higher on the re-rate. The licensed providers spent an average of just under one year between their initial rating and their re-rating. These licensed providers showed significant improvements in their scores during the re-rate.

#### **Supports:**

Relationship Based Professional Development: Relationship Based Professional Development focuses on building trusted relationships to foster change and facilitate improvement. Early Achievers uses relationship based professional development across all of its direct service work with providers including *technical assistance, rating readiness consultation, and coaching*. While these three elements are often tracked separately and refer to distinct points in a provider's participation in Early Achievers, they are part of an integrated approach to working with providers over time to support continuous quality improvements. In any given month, the majority of Early Achievers participants will receive some type of Relationship Based Professional Development.

Rating Readiness Consultation: Facilities that successfully complete all Level 2 activities and intend to pursue an on-site evaluation have the opportunity to access *Rating Readiness Consultation*. Rating Readiness Consultation is customized on-site support to help facilities prepare for a quality rating of Level 3 or above. It is distinct from Technical Assistance in terms of the type of support provided. In particular, there is a focus on key elements of the quality standards that have the most impact on ratings, including preparing for the CLASS and ERS assessments. Rating readiness consultation may be provided to classroom teachers, as needed to prepare them for successful interactions and learning environments as defined by CLASS and ERS.

Coaching Services: Coaching is a long-term continuous service available to all rated facilities. Coaches are employed by Child Care Aware of Washington. After an Early Achievers facility receives their first rating, they will be assigned a Coach by their local lead agency. The role of the Coach is to help facilities:

Understand and use Early Achievers ratings and assessment data,  
Identify goals and make plans to achieve goals,  
Access resources to support achievement of goals, and  
Implement strategies that sustain and continue to build on quality gains over time.

Additional ERS Feedback: The Early Achievers database, the Web-based Early Learning System (WELS), provides high level information on ERS scores to providers, but participating programs desired more specific information on items where

scores did not meet the minimum threshold. As a result, customized ERS feedback reports are available on items that are scored a 3.0 or below. Coaches review this information with programs to give providers a more detailed understanding of the rating to support the development of quality improvement goals. Data on ERS are being used by coaches to partner with child care participants to develop quality improvement plans. These quality improvement plans support providers to make changes in practice that improve their quality and lead to higher Early Achievers ratings in the future.

Additional Training: Early Achievers Professional Training Series offers six trainings to all participants, including an introduction to the ERS and CLASS. These initial six trainings in Level 2 used to prepare programs for rating were useful, but professionals asked for a deeper level training to prepare for rating. Additional trainings were developed and delivered by the Early Achievers Institutes and the Child Care Aware Professional Development Academy, offering deeper levels of ERS content to support participating programs. Participants receive the ERS resources including the "All About" books which provide detailed information and resources.

**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>	7,406	7,406	7,406	7,406	7,406
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	7,221	6,604	5,178	3,923	3,424
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	23	592	1,542	2,273	2,512
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	47	67	214	418	542
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	76	93	299	486	561
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>	39	50	172	306	368
<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>	7,406	7,406	7,406	7,406	2,800
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	7,221	6,493	5,395	4,958	4,606
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	23	732	1,758	2,004	1,869
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	47	181	198	351	771
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	76		54	92	158
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>	39		1	1	2
<b>Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated</b>					1,984

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

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

The base line is held constant in all reporting years. To maintain preparation methodologies, the "Number of programs in Tier 1" shown in the actuals table (B)(4)(c)(1) represent the difference between the baseline (7,406) and the total number of participating sites at the end of each calendar year.

The numbers reported in the actuals table and the data notes employ different methodologies for calculating Tier 1. In the actuals table, the Tier 1 calculation is the total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS (7,406) minus the total programs in Tiers 2-5. This methodology is used in the data table itself to keep the baseline, 7,406, consistent. The total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS, however, has changed over the lifetime of the grant. In the data notes, the Tier 1 calculation is the actual total of programs enrolled in the TQRIS minus the programs in Tiers 2-5. This method of reporting has been consistent across all of WA State's RTT-ELC submissions.

Data represents the available universe in Washington State of active licensed child care centers and family home child care programs (FAMLINK), ECEAP sites (ELMS) and Head Start programs (HSSCO). Counts are less the number of providers and programs participating in TQRIS or the HS/ECEAP pilot. In order to calculate the number of providers for 2012, DEL took the total of providers in the state (7406) and subtracted the actual numbers of licensed providers that registered in TQRIS (732) and HS/ECEAP pilot sites (181).

In 2012 the total number of providers in the state changed slightly from 2011 (i.e. ECEAP providers increased from 260 to 265, causing the total number of HS/ECEAP sites to go from 675 to 680; licensed child care centers went down from 1,567 to 1,553; and family home child care programs went down from 5,164 to 4,363, for a grand total in 2012 of 6,596). Therefore, the actual number of Level 1 providers in 2012 was  $6,596 - 732 - 181 = 5,683$ .

In 2013 the total number of providers in the state also changed slightly from 2012 (i.e. ECEAP providers increased from 265 to 266, causing the total number of HS/ECEAP sites to go from 680 to 681; licensed child care centers went down from 1,553 to 1,477; and family home child care programs went down 4,363 to 3,989, for a grand total in 2013 of 6,147). Therefore, the actual number of Level 1 providers in 2013 was  $6,147 - 754$  (Total Participating centers) -  $1,042$  (Total Participating Family Homes) -  $215$  (Total Participating HS/ECEAP sites) =  $4,136$

In 2014 the total number of providers in the state also changed from 2013 (i.e. ECEAP providers increased from 266 to 279. However, the total number of HS/ECEAP went down from 681 to 649; licensed child care centers went up from 1,477 to 1,486; and family home child care programs went down 3,989 to 3,840, for a grand total in 2014 of 5,815). Therefore, the actual number of Level 1 providers in 2014 was  $5,815 - 885$  (Total Participating Centers) -  $1,381$  (Total Participating Family Homes) -  $182$  (Total Participating HS/ECEAP sites) =  $3,367$

### **2015 Data Notes:**

In 2015 the total number of providers in the state also changed from 2014 (i.e. ECEAP sites increased from 279 to 324. The total number of HS/ECEAP sites increased from 649 to 689; licensed child care centers went up from 1,486 to 1,496; and family home child care programs went down 3,840 to 3,678, for a grand total in 2015 of 5,698). Therefore, the actual number of Level 1 providers in 2015 was  $5,698 - 992$  (Total Participating Centers) -  $1,506$  (Total Participating Family Homes) -  $372$  (Total Participating HS/ECEAP sites) =  $2,898$ .

Data comes from DEL's Managed Educational Registry and Information Tool (MERIT) database, which governs the application process for TQRIS and some of the related activities. Beginning in July 2012, facilities in this tier initiated their application for participation, which includes online registration (for director/owner and teaching staff), completion of a professional development training series, a self-assessment, and preparation for an on-site evaluation to establish the facilities' quality rating. Programs that were rated Levels 2-5 at Baseline were involved in the Early Adopters Pilot program.

In 2013, there were 1,758 licensed providers participating in the Early Achievers pipeline and had not yet received a quality rating, or had been rated at a Level 2 (6 Family Homes and 5 Child Care Centers).

In 2014, there were 2,004 licensed providers participating in the Early Achievers pipeline and had not yet received a quality rating, or had been rated at a Level 2 (125 Family Homes and 77 Child Care Centers).

### **2015 Data Notes:**

In 2015, there were 1,863 licensed providers and HS/ECEAP sites participating in the Early Achievers pipeline and had not



yet received a quality rating, or had been rated at a Level 2. In 2015, 6 HS/ECEAP sites rated at a level 2 (1863+6=1869).

In 2012, a sample of Head Start and ECEAP sites from various regions in the state were selected to participate in a pilot program, the results of which will inform the development of a statewide TQRIS program for all HS and ECEAP sites. All pilot sites are entering at Level 3 as assessed by quality assurance policies and curricula standards currently in place. The facility on-boarding process is being adjusted for this pilot to fit the specific needs of these programs while maintaining cohesion with the TQRIS implementation for licensed facilities.

In 2013, a total of 32 Licensed Providers (7 Family Homes and 25 Centers) had been rated at Level 3. Additionally, 166 HS/ECEAP sites were participating in the Early Achievers pipeline and awaiting ratings.

In 2014, a total of 238 Licensed Providers (97 Family Homes and 141 Centers) had been rated at Level 3. Additionally, 113 HS/ECEAP sites were participating in the Early Achievers pipeline and awaiting ratings.

**2015 Data Notes:**

In 2015, a total of 534 Licensed Providers (203 family home child care and 331 child care centers) had been rated at Level 3. Additionally, 236 HS/ECEAP sites were participating in the Early Achievers pipeline and awaiting rating and 1 HS/ECEAP site had been rated at a Level 3.

In August of 2012, DEL contracted with the University of Washington's Child Care Quality and Early Learning Research Center (UW-CQEL) through their existing academic partnership to continue management of the ratings process beyond the 2010-2011 QRIS pilot program. Development of the WELS information system completed the following October, and began testing collections of scored data in order to assign quality ratings. To bridge the gap between program and system implementations, UW-CQEL managed an off-line process to collect scored data and establish baseline ratings for the HS/ECEAP pilot at the time.

As of 2013, a total of 55 Licensed providers and HS/ECEAP sites received a quality rating of Level 4-5. This includes 2 family homes, 4 child care centers, and 49 HS/ECEAP sites (48 rated Level 4; 1 rated Level 5)

As of 2014, a total of 93 Licensed providers and HS/ECEAP sites received a quality rating of Level 4-5. This includes 5 family homes, 19 child care centers, and 69 HS/ECEAP sites (68 rated Level 4; 1 rated Level 5)

**2015 Data Notes:**

As of 2015, a total of 158 Licensed providers and HS/ECEAP sites received a quality rating of Level 4. This includes 6 family homes, 25 centers, and 127 HS/ECEAP sites. 2 HS/ECEAP sites were rated at a Level 5 in 2015.

**2015 Data Notes:**

As of 2015, a total of 1,984 Licensed providers and HS/ECEAP sites are enrolled in Early Achievers but not yet rated. This includes 1,230 family homes, 518 centers, and 236 HS/ECEAP sites.

**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.

**Early Achievers Enrollment Targets:** Washington achieved 99 percent of our 2015 enrollment target for licensed centers; however, the state is under target for the number of family home child care programs that are participating in Early Achievers. This is due in large part to the continuing reduction in the number of family home child care providers in the state. When the RTT-ELC application was written, there were 5,164 family home child care providers in the state. As of December 31, 2015, there are 3,678 family home providers in the state, a reduction of 29 percent. Given Washington State's performance against targets for participating centers, which typically have far more children enrolled, the actual number of children served is 78,399, or 90 percent of the RTT-ELC target.

**Early Achievers Ratings Targets:** Washington has faced two primary challenges in achieving the RTT-ELC ratings targets. First, programs moved to full rating slower than initially anticipated in the early years of implementation. As a result, Washington implemented several policy changes that encouraged providers to go through the ratings process (See Section B1 of the 2014 APR). Second, many programs rated a Level 2 which does not demonstrate a level of quality (Levels 3-5). In 2014, Washington implemented several new policies to provide greater supports to providers to be successful in the ratings process (See Section B1 of the 2014 APR). Regardless, Washington is currently under target for the number of sites rated a Level 3 - 5. As of December 31, 2015, 680 licensed child care sites have completed a full rating. Of these, 565 programs have achieved a Level 3-5, while 115 programs rated a Level 2. It is projected that the number of sites rated

Levels 3 - 5 will continue to grow throughout the year as policy changes encourage more providers to enter the ratings process with greater supports to achieve a Level 3-5.

**HS/ECEAP Targets:** Participation in the higher levels of Early Achievers at the end of 2015 was higher than 2015 targets. The target for 2015 was to serve 17,361 high needs children (70 percent) participating in Head Start or ECEAP at Early Achievers Levels 3-5. By the end of the year, there were 18,289 children (74 percent) participating in HS/ECEAP at Levels 3-5. Therefore, HS/ECEAP child counts are now exceeding RTT-ELC targets. Site counts stand at 372, or 75 percent of the RTT-ELC target of 493. Provider participation at the highest levels of quality increased significantly in 2015, with the addition of 60 sites at Early Achievers Level 4+. In addition, there was an overall increase in 10 ECEAP/HS grantee/contractors in Early Achievers. Strategies for continued growth among HS/ECEAP providers include:

- 1. Recruitment:** DEL is actively recruiting HS/ECEAP providers to participate in Early Achievers.
- 2. New participation requirements for ECEAP:** In addition to legislation passed in 2013 that requires ECEAP sites to participate in Early Achievers by June 30, 2015, new/expansion ECEAP sites also have timelines for EA participation.
- 3. Incentives:** In addition to the incentives (stipends) to support Early Achievers participation that are part of the Reciprocity Plan, DEL is also offering tiered reimbursement and subsidy contracts to ECEAP sites

### **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"?

In Washington's TQRIS, Early Achievers, providers must rate a 3-5 to be considered as having reached a level of quality. This definition of quality is consistent from when Early Achievers was a voluntary program to the passage of the Early Start Act in which Early Achievers is mandatory for all providers serving children receiving subsidy and ECEAP/HS providers. WCCC subsidy providers must rate at a Level 3 to continue to qualify for subsidy payments. ECEAP sites must rate at a Level 4 or above. Both categories of providers have individual timelines in which they must join Early Achievers, complete Level 2 trainings and activities, and rate at quality. Within a 3-5 quality rating, Washington State considers a rating of 4 or 5 to be its highest tiers.

**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	1,936	21%	1,936	21%	4,948	53%	6,024	64%	6,024	64%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	3,401	23%	3,401	23%	8,692	57%	10,960	73%	11,338	75%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	108	0.2%	5,745	9%	15,621	25%	21,616	34%	23,521	37%
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	9,532	1,936	21%	9,532	4,014	42%	9,532	4,747	50%	9,532	4,604	48%	9,532	9,869	104%
<i>Specify:</i>	ECEAP														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	15,117	3,401	23%	15,117	7,175	47%	15,117	6,371	42%	15,117	4,668	31%	15,117	8,420	56%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	5,592			5,592			5,592			5,592			5,592		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	9,682			9,682			9,682			9,682			9,682		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	3,374			3,374			3,374			3,374			3,374		
Programs receiving CCDF funds	63,440	108	0.2%	63,440	11,189	18%	63,440	11,118	18%	63,440	9,272	15%	63,440	18,289	29%
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.

Baseline data was based on the number of children in ECEAP classrooms, provided by DEL (for Academic Year 2010-2011): 9,532 children served includes 8,024 ECEAP slots, 581 pre-school special education children, and 927 non-ECEAP children in ECEAP classrooms (all of whom benefit from the TQRIS). Targets for number of children with high needs served by ECEAP for 2012 were calculated by taking the total number of subsidized children ((8,605, or 8,024+581) and multiplying by the projected percent of ECEAP sites in Levels 2 or higher (i.e. 8,605 x 23 percent = 1,936)). This calculation includes only children served by programs in the top tiers of TQRIS (i.e. Levels 3-5), as HS and ECEAP sites enter at a Level 3 in TQRIS, as assessed by quality assurance policies and curricula standards currently in place. For Academic Year 2011-12, the total number of ECEAP-funded slots reported by DEL is 8,391. For more on calculating the total number of high needs children served by ECEAP, see the notes below on children served by programs receiving funds from the state's CCDF program.

As of 2012, the number of high needs children served by ECEAP providers in the top tiers of TQRIS includes all ECEAP slots (4,014) in the 181 HS/ECEAP pilot sites. NOTE: a technical correction was made to the RTT-ELC application percentage target for 2014 (was incorrectly reported as 70 percent).

As of 2013, the number of high needs children served by ECEAP providers in the top tiers of the TQRIS is 4,747 slots. Please note that in 2013 the HS/ECEAP reciprocity plan was finalized and implemented, and as a result some of the original 181 HS/ECEAP sites that were counted as part of the pilot in 2012 are no longer counted as HS/ECEAP. This is because sites that are co-located at licensed providers and have fewer than 75 percent child slots funded by HS/ECEAP are now being counted as licensed providers, and as a result their ECEAP slots are no longer being counted toward ECEAP for reporting purposes (this total includes 23 HS/ECEAP sites that account for 413 slots HS/ECEAP slots). In addition, several HS/ECEAP sites that were originally part of the pilot closed, so those slots are no longer being counted. Finally, many of the remaining pilot sites and the new HS/ECEAP sites that have entered Early Achievers have fewer slots per site on average than the original group of pilot sites from 2012, causing the total number of slots to be lower than expected when compared to the increase in total number of sites. These reductions in total HS/ECEAP slot counts will likely be offset in 2014 by ECEAP integration and expansion activities.

Also, please note that given the lack of available program-specific slot data for the pilot sites that remain on the HS/ECEAP pathway, the number of ECEAP slots is an estimate derived by applying the percent of ECEAP slots in the original 181 pilot sites to the 138 remaining pilot sites. Actual program-specific slot counts were available and reported for the 77 HS/ECEAP sites that signed up for EA after the pilot program.

As of 2014, the number of high needs children served by ECEAP providers in the top tiers of TQRIS is 4,604. Please note that in 2014 sites identified for participation in TQRIS by an ECEAP contractor were initially counted toward ECEAP participation until their eligibility for the Head Start (HS)/ECEAP reciprocity plan could be determined. Some of these sites are no longer counted as HS/ECEAP providers because they are sites that are co-located at licensed providers and are now being counted as licensed providers. The resulting drop in child counts for HS/ECEAP in 2014 mirrors the drop in program counts for levels three through five in Washington's TQRIS. Also, please note that slot counts were derived for the 9 sites for which actual slot counts were unavailable by applying the percent of ECEAP slots across all HS/ECEAP sites.

#### **2015 Data Notes:**

As of 2015, the number of high needs children served by ECEAP providers in the top tiers of TQRIS is 9,869. Please note that slot counts were derived for the 30 sites for which actual slot counts were unavailable by applying the percent of ECEAP slots across all HS/ECEAP sites.

Baseline data was based on the number of children in ECEAP classrooms, provided by DEL (for Academic Year 2010-2011): 9,532 children served includes 8,024 ECEAP slots, 581 preschool special education children, and 927 non-ECEAP children in ECEAP classrooms (all of whom benefit from the TQRIS). Targets for number of children with high needs served by ECEAP for 2012 were calculated by taking the total number of subsidized children ((8,605, or 8,024+581) and multiplying by the projected percent of ECEAP sites in Levels 2 or higher (i.e. 8,605 x 23 percent = 1,936)). This calculation includes only

children served by programs in the top tiers of TQRIS (i.e. Levels 3-5), as HS and ECEAP sites enter at a Level 3 in TQRIS, as assessed by quality assurance policies and curricula standards currently in place. For Academic Year 2011-12, the total number of ECEAP-funded slots reported by DEL is 8,391. For more on calculating the total number of high needs children served by ECEAP, see the notes below on children served by programs receiving funds from the state's CCDF program.

As of 2012, the number of high needs children served by ECEAP providers in the top tiers of TQRIS includes all ECEAP slots (4,014) in the 181 HS/ECEAP pilot sites. NOTE: a technical correction was made to the RTT-ELC application percentage target for 2014 (was incorrectly reported as 70 percent).

As of 2013, the number of high needs children served by ECEAP providers in the top tiers of the TQRIS is 4,747 slots. Please note that in 2013 the Head Start (HS)/ECEAP reciprocity plan was finalized and implemented, and as a result some of the original 181 HS/ECEAP sites that were counted as part of the pilot in 2012 are no longer counted as HS/ECEAP. This is because sites that are co-located at licensed providers and have fewer than 75 percent child slots funded by HS/ECEAP are now being counted as licensed providers, and as a result their ECEAP slots are no longer being counted toward ECEAP for reporting purposes (this total includes 23 HS/ECEAP sites that account for 413 slots HS/ECEAP slots). In addition, several HS/ECEAP sites that were originally part of the pilot closed, so those slots are no longer being counted. Finally, many of the remaining pilot sites and the new HS/ECEAP sites that have entered Early Achievers have fewer slots per site on average than the original group of pilot sites from 2012, causing the total number of slots to be lower than expected when compared to the increase in total number of sites. These reductions in total HS/ECEAP slot counts will likely be offset in 2014 by ECEAP integration and expansion activities.

Also, please note that given the lack of available program-specific slot data for the pilot sites that remain on the HS/ECEAP pathway, the number of ECEAP slots is an estimate derived by applying the percent of ECEAP slots in the original 181 pilot sites to the 138 remaining pilot sites. Actual program-specific slot counts were available and reported for the 77 HS/ECEAP sites that signed up for EA after the pilot program.

As of 2014, the number of high needs children served by Head Start providers in the top tiers of TQRIS is 4,668. Please note that in 2014 sites identified for participation in TQRIS by a Head Start grantee were initially counted toward Head Start participation until their eligibility for the Head Start (HS)/ECEAP reciprocity plan could be determined. Some of these sites are no longer counted as HS/ECEAP providers because they are sites that are co-located at licensed providers and are now being counted as licensed providers. The resulting drop in child counts for HS/ECEAP in 2014 mirrors the drop in program counts for levels three through five in Washington's TQRIS. Also, please note that slot counts were derived for the 9 sites for which actual slot counts were unavailable by applying the percent of Head Start slots across all HS/ECEAP sites.

**2015 Data Notes:**

As of 2015, the number of high needs children served by Head Start providers in the top tiers of TQRIS is 8,420. Please note that slot counts were derived for the 30 sites for which actual slot counts were unavailable by applying the percent of Head Start slots across all HS/ECEAP sites.

DEL is working with IDEA Part C to establish an agreement to promote TQRIS. Currently the majority of IDEA Part C programs are home-based and would therefore not fit within the model outlined in the TQRIS Standards. The actual number of children served for 2011 is 5,567; 2012 is 5,814; 2013 is 5,814; and 2014 is 6,529 (See Table (A)(1)(3)(a) for more information); these numbers fluctuate annually.

Classes for children funded by Part B are operated by school districts not licensed by DEL and so cannot participate in TQRIS. As indicated in our MOU, OSPI and DEL have agreed to develop a work plan to integrate classes serving children under Part B into TQRIS, as appropriate. Correction to data reported in the RTT-ELC application: IDEA Part B, program year 2011 was incorrectly reported as 9,946. The actual number of children served for program year 2011 was 9,682. For 2012, the number of children is 9,808. For 2013, the number of children is 9,515. For 2014, the number of children is 9,701. For 2015, the number of children is 10,015. See Table (A)(1)(3)(a) for more information.

Title I expenditures are determined at the local school district level. For the 2011 school year, district end-of-year Title I - OSPI reports show that 3,374 children received preschool services in district-operated programs. (Correction to data reported in the RTT-ELC Application - Title I, program year 2011 was reported as 3,260). The actual number of children served for program year 2012 is 2,556. For 2013, the actual number of children served for program year 2013 is 742. For



2014, the actual number of children served is 371. For 2015, the actual number of children is 402. See Table (A)(1)(3)(a) for more information.

As of 2012, the actual number of children served by providers in the top tiers of TQRIS that receive funds from the state's CCDF program only includes children enrolled in the 181 HS/ECEAP pilot sites (who enter at Level 3, as assessed by quality assurance policies and curricula standards currently in place). These children (4,014+7175 = 11,189) were also reported for ECEAP and HS providers in the first two rows of this table, see notes above.

The 2012 actual number for total children with high needs served by programs in the state is 63,298; this number is an estimate derived from the 2012 number of total licensed sites and data provided by the Washington State University (WSU) Child Care Survey as of 2010 (the report is bi-annual and has yet to be released for 2012). This number is derived for licensed providers by multiplying the WSU estimate of the percent of licensed providers that receive subsidies (77.3 percent) by the actual number of licensed child care centers in the state for 2012 (1,553). This total number of providers (1,200) is multiplied by the average number of subsidized kids per facility ( $1,200 \times 19.3 = 23,169$ ) to get children counts. This same equation is applied to Family Home Child Care for 2012, i.e. ( $4,363 \times 67.9$  percent (for FHC) = 2,962;  $2,962 \times 4.66 = 13,805$ ). These two numbers are then added to the total number of subsidized children served by HS and ECEAP in the state for 2012 (100 percent of HS children served, or 17,352 (HS), and 8,979 ECEAP children served (i.e. 8,391 subsidized ECEAP slots and 588 pre-k special education children in ECEAP classrooms), respectively, to get a grand total of 63,305 children with high needs served by programs in the state for 2012. This methodology was used to derive the baseline number of high needs children as well. The number of pre-k special education children in ECEAP classrooms served in 2012 was derived by taking the number used in the baseline calculation (581 special education children in pre-k ECEAP classrooms, from DEL, 2010) and dividing by the total number of children in pre-k for that year ( $581/9681 = 6$  percent; refer to Table 3, IDEA Part B for more detail on total number of pre-k children). This percentage was then applied to the 2012 total number of children in pre-k ( $9808 \times 6$  percent = 588) to get the derived number of children in pre-k special education in ECEAP classrooms.

In 2013, the actual number of children served by providers in the top tiers of TQRIS that receive funds from the state's CCDF program only includes children enrolled in the 215 HS/ECEAP sites enrolled in the TQRIS (who enter at Level 3, as assessed by quality assurance policies and curricula standards currently in place). These children (11,118 slots) were also reported for ECEAP and HS providers in the first two rows of this table, see notes above for more context on why the number of slots went down slightly in 2013 due to the implementation of HS/ECEAP reciprocity.

The 2013 actual number for total children with high needs served by programs in the state is 56,204; this number is an estimate derived from the 2013 number of total licensed sites and data provided by the Washington State University (WSU) Child Care Survey as of 2012 (the report is bi-annual). This number is derived for licensed providers by multiplying the WSU estimate of the percent of licensed child care centers that receive subsidies (79 percent) by the actual number of licensed child care centers in the state for 2013 (1,477). This total number of providers (1,167) is multiplied by the average number of subsidized kids per facility ( $1,167 \times 19.8 = 23,103$ ) to get child counts. This same equation is applied to Family Home Child Care for 2013, i.e. ( $3,989 \times 63.4$  percent) = 2,529;  $2,529 \times 2.6 = 6,575$ ). These two numbers are then added to the total number of subsidized children served by HS and ECEAP in the state for 2013 (100 percent of HS children served, or 17,761, and 8,764 ECEAP children served (i.e. 8,391 subsidized ECEAP slots and a minimum of 373 pre-k special education children in ECEAP classrooms), respectively, to get a grand total of 56,204 children with high needs served by programs in the state for 2013.

In 2014, the actual number of children served by providers in the top tiers of TQRIS that receive funds from the state's CCDF program only includes children enrolled in the 182 HS/ECEAP sites enrolled in the TQRIS (who enter at Level 3, as assessed by quality assurance policies and curricula standards currently in place). These children (9,272 slots) were also reported for ECEAP and HS providers in the first two rows of this table, see notes above for more context on why the number of slots went down in 2014 due to some providers no longer being classified as HS/ECEAP providers because they are co-located at licensed providers and are now being counted as licensed providers.

The 2014 actual number for total children with high needs served by programs in the state is 55,058; this number is an estimate derived from the 2014 number of total licensed sites and data provided by the Washington State University (WSU) Child Care Survey as of 2012 (the report is bi-annual but a new report has not been published in time for updating 2014 actual numbers). This number is derived for licensed providers by multiplying the WSU estimate of the percent of licensed child care centers that receive subsidies (79 percent) by the actual number of licensed child care centers in the state for 2013 (1,486). This total number of providers (1,174) is multiplied by the average number of subsidized kids per facility ( $1,714 \times 19.8 = 23,244$ ) to get child counts. This same equation is applied to Family Home Child Care for 2013, i.e. ( $3,840 \times 63.4$  percent) = 2,435;  $2,435 \times 2.6 = 6,330$ ). These two numbers are then added to the total number of subsidized children served by HS and ECEAP in the state for 2014 (100 percent of HS children served, or 16,172, and 9,312 ECEAP

children served (i.e. 8,741 subsidized ECEAP slots and a minimum of 571 pre-k special education children in ECEAP classrooms), respectively, to get a grand total of 55,058 children with high needs served by programs in the state for 2014.

For more detail on child count targets for HS/ECEAP, please refer to explanation above for HS/ECEAP child counts (in this table), as well as Table (A)(1)(3)(a). The total for CCDF child counts in this table differs from that in the A Tables, as this derived estimate does not include children who receive subsidies and are enrolled in other types of programs that are not participating in the TQRIS (i.e. unlicensed sites or non-ECEAP/HS sites).

In 2015, the actual number of children served by providers in the top tiers of TQRIS that receive funds from the state's CCDF program only includes children enrolled in the 372 HS/ECEAP sites enrolled in the TQRIS (who enter at Level 3, as assessed by quality assurance policies and curricula standards currently in place). These children (18,289 slots) were also reported for ECEAP and HS providers in the first two rows of this table.

The 2015 actual number for total children with high needs served by programs in the state is 61,028; this number is an estimate derived from the 2015 number of total licensed sites and data provided by the Washington State University (WSU) Child Care Survey as of 2014 (published in June 2015). This number is derived for licensed providers by multiplying the WSU estimate of the percent of licensed child care centers that receive subsidies (79.4 percent) by the actual number of licensed child care centers in the state for 2015 (1,496). This total number of providers (1,188) is multiplied by the average number of subsidized kids per facility ( $1,188 \times 22.2 = 26,374$ ) to get child counts. This same equation is applied to Family Home Child Care for 2015, i.e. ( $3,678 \times 61.8 \text{ percent} = 2,273$ ;  $2,273 \times 3.9 = 8,865$ ). These two numbers are then added to the total number of subsidized children served by HS and ECEAP in the state for 2015 (100 percent of HS children served, or 16,417, and 9,372 ECEAP children served (i.e. 10,091 subsidized ECEAP slots and a minimum of 719 pre-k special education children in ECEAP classrooms), respectively, to get a grand total of 61,028 children with high needs served by programs in the state for 2015.

For more detail on child count targets for HS/ECEAP, please refer to explanation above for HS/ECEAP child counts (in this table), as well as Table (A)(1)(3)(a). The total for CCDF child counts in this table differs from that in the A Tables, as this derived estimate does not include children who receive subsidies and are enrolled in other types of programs that are not participating in the TQRIS (i.e. unlicensed sites or non-ECEAP/HS sites).

**2015 Data Notes:**

In 2015, the actual number of children served by providers in the top tiers of TQRIS that receive funds from the state's CCDF program only includes children enrolled in the 372 HS/ECEAP sites enrolled in the TQRIS (who enter at Level 3, as assessed by quality assurance policies and curricula standards currently in place). These children (18,289 slots) were also reported for ECEAP and HS providers in the first two rows of this table.

The 2015 actual number for total children with high needs served by programs in the state is 55,058; this number is an estimate derived from the 2015 number of total licensed sites and data provided by the Washington State University (WSU) Child Care Survey as of 2014 (published in June 2015). This number is derived for licensed providers by multiplying the WSU estimate of the percent of licensed child care centers that receive subsidies (79.4 percent) by the actual number of licensed child care centers in the state for 2015 (1,496). This total number of providers (1,188) is multiplied by the average number of subsidized kids per facility ( $1,118 \times 22.2 = 26,358$ ) to get child counts. This same equation is applied to family home child care for 2015, (i.e.  $3,678 \times 61.8 \text{ percent} = 2,273$ ;  $2,273 \times 3.9 = 8,751$ ). These two numbers are then added to the total number of subsidized children served by HS and ECEAP in the state for 2015 (100 percent of HS children served, or 16,172, and 9,312 ECEAP children served (i.e. 8,741 subsidized ECEAP slots and a minimum of 571 pre-k special education children in ECEAP classrooms), respectively, to get a grand total of 55,058 children with high needs served by programs in the state for 2015.

For more detail on child count targets for HS/ECEAP, please refer to explanation above for HS/ECEAP child counts (in this table), as well as Table (A)(1)(3)(a). The total for CCDF child counts in this table differs from that in the A Tables, as this derived estimate does not include children who receive subsidies and are enrolled in other types of programs that are not participating in the TQRIS (i.e. unlicensed sites or non-ECEAP/HS sites).

### **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.

Refer to Performance (B)(4)(c)(1) Target Notes above.

### **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.

#### **Early Achievers Internal Validation Study**

Purpose: The overarching purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which the Early Achievers quality indicators and aggregate ratings are associated with measurable gains in children's outcomes across domains. The primary evaluation questions addressed include:

What is the quality of programs participating in Early Achievers?

What are the learning outcomes for children in programs participating in Early Achievers?

Do children in higher rated programs do better than children in lower rated programs?

Are the Early Achievers Quality Standards and relevant measures associated with children's learning?

Procedures: Study procedures included:

Recruitment

Hiring and training

Sampling and selection

Individual child assessments

Program, classroom and family child care home quality assessments

Data cleaning and organization

Data analyses and report writing

Study Recruitment: The University of Washington partnered with DEL in the summer of 2014 to begin recruitment activities. The initial sampling frame included 2,303 programs that were enrolled in Early Achievers. Directors and FCC owners were initially contacted via email to introduce the study and gauge interest in participation. Numerous targeted recruitment efforts followed, including in person presentations, mailings, and telephone communication.

Participation in the evaluation study was voluntary. Recruitment efforts included: Direct email messages from DEL requesting participation, direct mailings to providers, e-mail messages sent from CCA, e-mail messages sent from the Washington State Head Start and ECEAP Association, and at Early Achiever Institutes. University of Washington staff members were made available to visit with interested directors/owners in person during the summer of 2014 and also conducted phone calls to follow up and answer any study related questions throughout the recruitment process.

Timing of the recruitment into the study was confounded by Early Achievers enrollment in general and it was difficult to recruit a high number of programs. Therefore the sample should not be representative of all child care programs in

Washington State.

Child care center directors/family home child care owners served as primary contacts throughout the study. These contacts facilitated communication with classroom teachers and subsequently children's families, distributing parent consent forms for participation in study activities. Families and early learning professionals were incentivized for their participation, receiving \$5.00 upon delivery of surveys to be completed and returned to UW staff. Additionally, early learning professionals were offered their choice of a children's book (infant/toddler/preschool, English/Spanish) at the conclusion of each site visit.

Hiring and Training: The University of Washington began hiring research team staff members in August of 2014. Preferred candidates were screened for prior experience working with children, knowledge of standardized assessments, and education in early childhood development or a related field. Additionally, bilingual (Spanish and English) and region specific (Western, Central and Eastern Washington) candidates were desired.

Once on board per University of Washington protocol, staff members were trained on Human Subjects practices and day of visit procedures. The majority of training took place in September and focused on individual child assessment data collection tools. The staff was trained on one of two assessment batteries, preschool (PK) or infant/toddler (I/T). Training sessions consisted of direct instruction, partner practice, video coaching, lab assessment practice, and in-field assessments. At the conclusion of this training process, individual staff members were deployed to a participating site for a partner visit, accompanied by an experienced and reliable assessment lead.

Sampling and Selection Process: The initial sampling frame included all programs enrolled in Early Achievers. The sampling plan aimed for equal numbers of programs across quality rating levels and representation of child care centers (CCC), family child care homes (FCC) and Early Head Start/Head Start/ECEAP (EHS/HS/ECEAP) facilities. The study was designed to include both infant/toddler and preschool classrooms across all regions of the state. Enrolled, but not yet rated, as well as rated programs were targeted for participation.

Programs were given the opportunity to participate in the study if they were enrolled in Early Achievers, regardless of rating status (not yet rated, level 2, level 3, level 4, level 5) or program type (child care centers, family home child care, EHS/HS/ECEAP).

Classrooms in participating programs were blanketed, providing an opportunity for all parents/families/children to consent to study activities.

Classrooms were randomly selected for data collection depending on program composition (preschool, infant, toddler), so that no more than one preschool room, infant room, and toddler room (or combined infant/toddler room) was selected within each program.

Children in each classroom were then randomly selected for participation:

Up to eight children, four boys and four girls when possible, per preschool classroom

Up to four children, two boys and two girls when possible, per infant/ toddler classroom

Measures: Data collection consisted of direct assessments, indirect assessments, survey research, secondary data/record review, and direct observation. Targeted areas within these data collection processes will include: child development and learning, teacher-child interactions, global classroom quality, child & family demographics, engagement, and teacher demographics and experiences.

**Direct Child Assessments:**

Infants and toddlers up to two years and 11 months of age were assessed in the areas of receptive language, expressive language, fine motor, gross motor, and visual reception. These scales also yield an overall cognitive composite. Preschool age children (three years and above) participated in assessments measuring language, letter word knowledge, early writing, mathematics, early science, and executive functioning. Additionally, preschool children identified as having a primary language other than English were screened for language proficiency with the *Pre-LAS 2000*.

Cognitive: Infant and toddler children were administered the *Mullen Scales of Early Learning (Mullen)*. The *Mullen* consists of five individual scales, four of which comprise an overall Early Learning Cognitive Composite, measuring development in the area of cognitive functioning.

Early Reading: For preschool age children, letter word knowledge was measured using the *Woodcock- Johnson III Tests of Achievement (WJ III)* Letter-Word Identification subtest, which assesses a child's ability to identify letters and words. For Spanish speaking children, *Bateria III Woodcock-Muñoz* was administered.

Early Science: The *Lens on Science (LENS)* is an adaptive computer-based instrument that assesses preschool children's content and processing skill knowledge in science.

Early Writing: The *Early Writing Assessment (EWA)* measures early writing development and asks preschool children to write their name (*EWA Name*) as well as two Consonant-Vowel-Consonant words (*EWA Word*) from dictation.

Social-Emotional: *The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL)* yields Internalizing, Externalizing, and Total Problems scales as reported by parents and teachers/providers.

Executive function: Preschool aged children's executive functioning was assessed using the *Head Toes Knees and Shoulders (HTKS)*, a measure of behavior regulation, and effortful control specifically.

Expressive Language: The *Mullen Expressive Language* subscale was administered to infants and toddlers. This is a direct assessment of children's ability to use language.

Fine Motor: Infant and toddler's fine motor skills were assessed with the *Mullen Fine Motor* scale.

Gross Motor: The *Mullen Gross Motor* scale measures gross motor skills for infants and toddlers up to 33 months of age.

Mathematics: Preschool children's early math knowledge and skills were assessed using the *Tools for Early Assessment in Math (TEAM)*. Children participated in a Short Form version of the *TEAM*, which included twenty questions and a stop rule.

Receptive language: The *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Fourth edition (PPVT-4)* is an individually administered instrument measuring the receptive vocabulary of preschool children. The *PPVT-4* measures understanding of the spoken word and thus assesses receptive vocabulary levels. For Spanish speaking children, the *Test de Vocabulario en Imágenes Peabody (TVIP)* was also administered. Infant and toddler children were administered the *Mullen Receptive Language* subscale.

#### **Direct Classroom Assessments:**

Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS): The CLASS is a widely used process quality tool that assesses classroom practices by measuring teacher-child interactions and material use and is available in multiple versions. Each of the four versions of the CLASS used in this study incorporate a number of dimensions that load onto specific domains appropriate for a given age group. The tool has been linked to student achievement and development and has been validated in over 2,000 classrooms. The four CLASS versions include: Infant CLASS, Toddler CLASS, Pre-k CLASS, and Combined CLASS.

The Environment Rating Scale (ERS): The ERS, a measure of classroom interactions, activities and materials, is an indicator of environmental quality. These widely used, valid and reliable scales are designed to assess quality in early childhood environments. The scales, each comprised of six subscales, include the *ITERS-R*, *ECERS-R* and *FCCERS-R*.

Language Environment Analysis (LENA): The LENA is a language environment analysis device, or digital language processor (DLP) that assesses expressive and receptive language. The device is unobtrusive and is worn by an individual (e.g., placed in a pocket, worn on a lanyard) in both the home and early learning environment. A software package analyzes the data and provides estimates of language use by multiple parties within the environment. The software calculates various language characteristics in the form of word counts, conversation initiation, and conversational turns during various blocks of time.

Engagement in Classrooms Data Collection (ECDC): the ECDC is an observational tool that provides an organized approach to tracking children's engagement (or on-task) behaviors. It was designed for use as an indicator of a quality classroom environment, by looking at children's engagement with materials, peers, and adults. Adapted from the work of Shapiro (1996), this tool provides a systematic approach for observing and tracking young children's engagement behaviors. Data collectors recorded the occurrence of one of four types of behaviors: Mastery Engagement (ME), Functional Engagement (FE), Passive Off-Task (POFT), and Challenging Behaviors (CB).

Procedures: In the fall of 2014 and spring of 2015, data collectors trained on the child outcomes assessment battery, protocol and human subjects conducted direct child assessments. Quality program data collection followed Early Achievers procedures and protocols as closely as possible and consisted of direct observations by trained and reliable external assessors. Data collectors arrived at sites "unannounced". Data collection occurred over the course of two calendar days

under the following format:

Visit 1: ERS observations; LENA recording

Visit 2: CLASS and engagement observations; LENA recording

For the CLASS, four 20-minute observation cycles were conducted, as recommended by the instrument authors. These assessors coded and scored the observational measures at the conclusion of each site visit before submitting documents to office staff who then conducted a quality check on the data.

ERS data were collected during visits by reliable external assessors. Assessors were extensively trained to observe classrooms and provide ratings on the ERS measures. The ERS observations lasted for approximately three hours, during which time the data collectors limited their interactions with children and providers. At the conclusion of each site visit protocols were submitted to office staff who then conducted a quality check on the data.

The teachers/providers in observed rooms (during both the CLASS and ERS assessments) were asked to wear the LENA device. Teachers had the right to refuse to wear the device, regardless of whether or not they had previously agreed to wear it.

The engagement observation was conducted in conjunction with CLASS in all preschool, toddler and blended classrooms. Upon arrival at the center, data collectors randomly selected up to six children. These children were tracked cyclically for an average of 50 minutes.

Data Cleaning and Quality Checks: In the fall of 2015, all data was entered and quality checked.

Individual Child Assessment:

Child protocols were quality checked by staff for basal and ceiling adherence and item completion after the site visits.

Child protocols were summed for raw score totals after site visits.

Child protocol raw scores were re-checked and then converted to standard scores at the conclusion of the data collection window.

Staff entered individual child assessment information into a database.

30 percent of children were randomly selected for an additional quality check.

- o The child protocols were re-scored and re-converted to standard scores.
- o These were compared to the scores in the database.
- o Thus, a quality check on the paper copies and standard score conversions, as well as the data entry, was conducted.

Each variable was sorted and checked for errors. Outliers and missing data were then checked against the paper protocols/raw data to ensure accuracy. For the outcome measures, variables were standardized and sorted to identify scores at +/- 1.5 standard deviations. Outliers and missing data were checked against the paper protocols/raw data to ensure accuracy.

Classroom/program assessment:

Score sheets were reviewed at the conclusion of the site visit by an assessment lead, who checked raw scores and indicators.

After data entry, all variables were quality checked for accuracy.

Analysis:

Hierarchical Linear Modeling with liner and piece-wise regression analysis is currently underway. Final reports will be completed spring 2016.



## 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.

The redesign of Washington's Early Learning and Development Guidelines (formerly Washington State Early Learning and Development Benchmarks) began in October 2010 and were completed in the first quarter of 2012. The purpose of the redesign was to ensure that the Guidelines reflect new research and information, are culturally relevant for Washington's diverse population, and extend through grade three. DEL, OSPI, and Thrive led this effort. The new Guidelines span ages birth through third grade, include all areas of development, are compatible with other key standards (including Common Core and Head Start), and are structured to promote cultural inclusiveness and accessibility to a variety of audiences.

The Guidelines have been integrated into Washington's TQRIS and professional development systems through training and the Early Achievers Curricular Alignment Tool (CAT). The CAT is completed with the support of Technical Assistant Specialists and Coaches working with Early Achievers programs to evaluate whether program curriculum aligns with the Guidelines. This alignment is part of the quality standards in our TQRIS system and can result in earned points toward Levels 3 - 5 upon rating. The Guidelines are also aligned with our kindergarten entry assessment and transition process. The online Early Learning Guidelines training is required for all state-approved trainers and participants in Early Achievers. By December 31, 2015, 10,995 professionals completed this training setting a solid foundation on how the Early Learning Guidelines support sound child development and can be used as an aligning document birth through third grade.

During this reporting year, DEL continued to promote and use the Guidelines as a foundational element of our state early learning system:

DEL has continued to ensure resources are in place to support printing and distribution of the Guidelines in hard copy format in both English and Spanish for anyone who requests copies.

DEL has partnered with a local school district to develop supplemental materials specific to the K-3 population. These materials support implementation of key concepts within the Guidelines, which can be shared with other school districts and partners.

DEL has continued to provide information about the Guidelines at various conferences and training opportunities. This includes a session led jointly by DEL and OSPI, which provides information about the Guidelines and how they relate to the Common Core.

An action plan outlining implementation priorities for the continued local and state implementation of the Guidelines was created by DEL, OSPI, and Thrive. The action plan is available to guide further efforts as additional resources become available.

Library mini-grants in local communities that provide information to parents and families via visual displays and presentations about the Early Learning Guidelines and potential uses for families were implemented.



**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.

N/A

WASHINGTON DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREAS C(2) OR C(3)  
IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION  
PAGES 46 of 116 THROUGH 48 of 116 HAVE BEEN DELETED

## 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.

Early Achievers: Strengthening Families is the cornerstone of the Early Achievers Family Engagement and Partnership standard. A six-hour introductory Strengthening Families training is required for all Early Achievers facilities and points can be earned toward rating by completing the Strengthening Families Self-Assessment, developing a plan of action based on the results, and involving parents and families in long-term planning. State-approved trainers deliver this training statewide and more than 2,994 facility administrators have completed the training. According to post-training surveys, participants find this training valuable and it is consistently noted as a favorite among participants.

The Strengthening Families training continues to be one of the most popular trainings in the Level 2 Professional Training Series. DEL and CCA of WA have reviewed participant feedback about not only the content of the current training but also suggestions to build upon it. Participants have asked for more hands-on opportunities and reflection time to apply the training concepts to situations that they are currently managing within their facility or classroom, and they have asked for deeper, targeted trainings on each of the protective factors.

Parent Navigators: Administered by the Washington State Association of Head Start and ECEAP, Parent Navigators serve as a peer-to-peer resource for high-need families. A cadre of 20 Parent Navigators provide information sessions to parents and are members of the community as "peer experts" at Community Service Offices, community meetings, industry conferences, and other regional events on the importance and value of high-quality learning for children. The Parent Navigators average nine information sessions per month. Based on post-visit surveys, DEL has found that a majority of parents that participated in the information sessions had a better understanding of the value of high-quality early learning and, 50 percent of parents surveyed intended to enroll their child(ren) in an Early Achievers facility if possible. Of those who currently had children enrolled in child care, most intended to ask their provider if they were participating in Early Achievers and if they weren't, to encourage them do so. In general, participating parents and families report that they are very interested in learning more about high-quality child care and are encouraged that access to high-quality programs is within reach regardless of their socio-economic status/income.

Development of New Tools: In 2015, DEL and Child Care Aware worked together to assess the technology required to promote Early Achievers through an online platform. Currently, Child Care Aware of Washington has an online portal, but it has become outdated. In order to best serve the needs of families, the portal needs to be updated. Washington has explored the systems used in several other states and completed an assessment of the type of system that needs to be built. This work is continuing in 2016, and will use RTT-ELC funding through this period ending in 12/31/2016. DEL expects to launch a new online search tool in the beginning of 2017.

Home Visiting: In addition to the support that families receive through the TQRIS, Washington has made several notable achievements in home visiting in 2015. The Home Visiting Services Account (HVSA) is jointly administered by DEL and Thrive Washington. This account leverages private matching with public dollars.

Systems Building and Partnerships: Washington State continues to build upon our work to support effective implementation of evidence-based and research based home visiting through the Implementation Hub's focus on replication and expansion. This core structure takes what is known from Implementation Science and propels us to action. DEL has continued to build a structure for training, TA, and program support, including facilitation of continuous quality improvement (CQI) activities that are aligned with what science tells us works in the research setting and translates it into each community's unique setting. This translation process includes what DEL believes are the critical elements to support

effective implementation, and will help us support organizational leadership and ensure a strong workforce and, ultimately, achieve positive child and family outcomes.

An innovative rural home visiting approach for engagement resulted in 3 rural communities implementing an evidence-based home visiting program. We know that rural and frontier Washington counties often have high rates of poverty, fewer social and health resources, longer distances to travel, and less local infrastructure, making it difficult to create and sustain evidence-based home visiting programs. By focusing on rural community priorities and developing a community-driven process through understanding the individual needs of rural communities, Washington is cultivating preparedness for new evidence-based services in highly isolated, remote areas of the state. Each step of the rural planning process provides an opportunity for communities to reflect on their needs and capacity.

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Planning: The home visiting governance structure was fully activated in the past year. In January 2014 the newly formed Home Visiting Leadership Forum met to engage with leaders from DEL, the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), Department of Health (DOH), Thrive, and the Gates Foundation. This meeting opened doors and opportunities including work with DSHS, as they recognized home visiting to be a strong engagement strategy for TANF families. Since March 2014, leadership at all levels (DEL, DSHS and Thrive) has met to gain common understanding and develop a shared vision for how to successfully partner on new approaches to home visiting. When \$2.4 million dollars from DSHS was deposited into the HVSA in June 2014 weekly work groups emerged with staff from the three offices. In July a "TANF and Home Visiting 101" dialog between agency leadership and engaged partners took place in order to learn more about each agency's interests, needs and contribution potentials.

Thrive, DEL, and DSHS are supporting a community engagement process with local experts and community partners to inform how to support communities in developing strong local family engagement and home visiting referral pathways between DSHS and local home visiting programs. In the fall of 2014, Thrive, in partnership with DEL and DSHS, announced an RFP to expand voluntary home visiting services for TANF families. Approximately \$900,000 dollars will be available through the RFP process, allowing Thrive to support services for 150-250 new families for a two-year period in early 2015. This partnership and approach will strengthen our capacity to learn more about serving TANF families and will allow us to strengthen our current data collection on families being served by TANF and focus on increasing coordination of existing services.

Data collected through our Maternal, Infant Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV) work, and through focus groups exploring barriers to serving the most vulnerable families, indicated that home visiting programs needed more technical assistance support to help them serve vulnerable families, especially those faced with domestic violence. To address this need, Thrive, the Washington State Office of Crime Victims Advocacy, and DEL worked in close partnership with the Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence (WSCADV), which led to a specialized domestic violence training using the *Healthy Moms, Happy Babies* curriculum developed by Futures Without Violence (FWV). Nine regional trainings offered between December 2013 and March 2014 brought new skills and connections to over 500 Washington early learning practitioners, indicating that demand is high for additional training and resources in this area. Next steps include providing follow-up training and consultation on safety planning and on the impact of domestic violence on parenting. Training team debriefings and analysis of the pre- and post-survey results will drive decisions to add other types of training opportunities.

Early Learning Regional Coalitions: In 2015, the Early Learning Regional Coalitions worked toward three goals:

**Goal 1** - Early Learning Regional Coalitions have the capacity and infrastructure necessary to coordinate the early learning system in their region

**Goal 2** - Early Learning Regional Coalitions are effective platforms for implementing prioritized strategies of the *Early Learning Plan*

**Goal 3** - Early Learning Regional Coalitions are building public awareness of the importance of and increased investment in early learning programs and services

To carry out these three goals, Community Momentum grants are awarded to each coalition. The three priorities of the 2015 Community Momentum work were to deepen family engagement work, to build coalition muscle around advocacy, and to advance racial equity.

Through regular capacity-building meetings, peer sharing, and technical assistance, the coalitions continued to develop stronger decision-making tools and expanded their participant rosters. They created and leveraged public awareness opportunities in their regions and in Olympia to state the case for early learning among policymakers and other stakeholders.

In particular, they demonstrated increased capacity to come together as a group around common policy goals, culminating

in an advocacy day focused on the Early Start Act.

Home visiting: In 2015 the coalitions continued to make connections to home visiting services in their region. They used different approaches to learn more about what services are available to the families in their region, as well as draw connections and identify gaps. Among the projects that coalitions launched in 2015 are:

1. Asset mapping to identify significant barriers and challenges that will need to be addressed in order to expand existing home visiting programs or develop new ones
2. Connecting to home visitors through existing networks and offer training and professional development opportunities on topics like reflective supervision, ACES, and worker safety
3. Hosting regular interactions and building a list of existing services
4. Developing an advocacy platform to support the expansion of home visiting services
5. Creating referral networks and decision trees to promote the most efficacious outcomes for families and work toward centralized supports

"Love. Talk. Play." (LTP): In 2015, the Love.Talk.Play. campaign was integrated more thoughtfully and strategically into family engagement efforts happening throughout the state. This was part of the work of the Early Learning Regional Coalitions.

Coalitions used "Love. Talk. Play." to:

- Connect with prioritized families, especially those furthest from opportunity (for example: rural and remote families, English language learners and tribes)
- Facilitate conversations with parents about developmental screening
- Enhance caregivers' understanding about their important role, and develop leadership pipelines for parents
- Build momentum and awareness about early learning and the work of the early learning system
- Talk with lawmakers and other potential early learning champions, such as business owner

The campaign strategy was focused on high-quality, repeat interactions that are found to increase parents' understanding about early learning and their role as their children's first and most important teachers. In 2015, there was a clear shift in the number of such interactions with parents, as well as a focus on families furthest from opportunity. Through the work of the coalitions, the campaign reached more than 4,000 caregivers with repeat events, and more than 79 percent were identified as furthest from opportunity, based on risk factors used by state agencies. Another 10,000 caregivers were reached with one-time events or distribution of "Love. Talk. Play." materials. Among the audiences reached are family, friend and neighbor (FFN) caregivers, ECEAP and Head Start families, families involved in the child welfare system, pregnant and parenting teens, and those with second-language learners.

In addition, "Love. Talk. Play." materials were distributed to child care providers, libraries, clinics, and others. Weekly tips and fun facts about child development were distributed through social media and a website, as well as to e-mail subscribers.

## 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.

The Washington State Core Competencies for Early Care and Education Professionals (Core Competencies) are foundational to Washington's professional development system and make up the statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. All community and technical college programs in early childhood education recognize the Core Competencies as the standard for core knowledge and skills for early learning professionals. Each of the colleges align all early learning program curricula with the state's Core Competencies.

The Department of Early Learning in partnership with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) adopted statewide "stackable certificates" in early childhood education. This three-stage stackable certificate includes consistent course numbers and credentials that build on each other, provides transferable credits, and lead to a one-year state credential. The stackable certificates allow for a smooth transition for students interested in progressing to a two-year degree in early childhood education. The first of the stackable certificates, the Initial Certificate, is offered through a variety of delivery formats and are available in English, Spanish, and Somali.

Community colleges offer a scholarship program called Early Achievers Opportunity Grants. This funding provides students with tuition coverage, books, and other resources such as tutoring and a point-of-contact advising model. In this model, one advisor serves as the single point of contact for all early childhood education students and provides one-on-one guidance to academic advising, registration, and other resources to support student success.

In fall of 2015, DEL in partnership with SBCTC developed a career planning portal that serves as a web based guide for career planning. The career planning portal allows students the opportunity to explore career options in early learning, roles, qualifications, and desirable degrees. Through the site, students can also search for programs based on program delivery model and geographical location, ultimately guiding them directly to the college's early learning point of contact.

Over the past year, Washington's focus has been on the evolving workforce challenge tied to the growing demand for early learning professionals. The Department of Early Learning is leading a state work group focusing on workforce development and the state's professional development system. Many of Washington's institutions of higher education, both two-year and four-year institutions, are actively engaged in this state advisory team along with other key state partners. The outcome of this work group is to provide policy recommendations by June 30, 2016 to advance our state's professional development system and workforce initiatives.

**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.

N/A

WASHINGTON DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA D(2) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION.  
PAGES 54 of 116 THROUGH 57 of 116 HAVE BEEN DELETED

## 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.

#### **Washington's kindergarten transition process is the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS)**

WaKIDS is a way to:

- Welcome families to school with one-on-one teacher meetings, before or just after the school year begins
- Learn about students' strengths through an observational assessment in the first seven weeks of school
- Share information with pre-kindergarten communities that will help improve the transition for students and families into kindergarten

RTT-ELC funding was used primarily to support teacher training for WaKIDS. A significant portion of the training introduced teachers to observational assessment and Washington's KEA, *GOLD™* by Teaching Strategies®. In 2015, 1,280 teachers new to WaKIDS completed the two-day introductory training and 164 returning teachers completed the optional three hours of advanced training.

Washington has been phasing in its kindergarten transition process over four years, in concert with its scale-up of state-funded, full-day kindergarten. Fall of 2015 was Washington's fourth year of collecting baseline entry assessment data in six domains: social-emotional, cognitive, physical, language, literacy, and mathematics. Washington uses *GOLD™* as the whole-child assessment portion of the kindergarten transition process and in 2015 assessed 58,656 kindergartners, reaching 74 percent of the state's kindergartners. OSPI publishes WaKIDS data at the state, Educational Service District (ESD), school district, and school levels on the State Report Card. The Fall 2015 WaKIDS Data Summary provides a guide to the State Report Card data.

In 2015, OSPI engaged in a process to update the WaKIDS objectives/dimensions and reduced the number of assessed items from 36 to 31 items included in the Whole Child Assessment (*GOLD™* by Teaching Strategies®). OSPI believes this revised slate of objectives and dimensions will better inform instruction and connect to end-of-year standards, while continuing to provide important information about kindergartners' entering strengths in all six areas of development and



learning.

No additional reliability and validity studies have been conducted in Washington since the University of Washington completed its inter-rater reliability and concurrent validity study of *GOLD™* by Teaching Strategies® in 2013. However, OSPI made an inter-rater reliability (IRR) certification part of WaKIDS 101 teacher training, and reached out to teachers trained in previous years with financial incentives to complete their IRR. As a result, among the 2,974 teachers participating in 2015, 2,473 (83 percent) have current IRR certificates. Of 1,280 teachers new to WaKIDS in 2015, 1,150 (90 percent) completed their IRR certification, and 1,380 (82 percent) of the 1,690 returning teachers have current IRR certificates.

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.

2015 was another year of growth for WaKIDS. The Governor signed the 2015-17 state biennial operating budget that provides sufficient funding for 100 percent of kindergarten students in the state to receive full-day kindergarten beginning in the 2016-17 school year. However, districts are not required to offer full-day kindergarten in eligible schools until the 2017-18 school year, at which time it is required by the Basic Education Act. As WaKIDS is required of all state-funded full-day kindergartens, OSPI expects a significant increase in participation in 2016-17, bringing participation very close to 100 percent. The number of schools participating in WaKIDS grew from 623 to 887 in 2015, and the number of districts increased from 193 to 257. Teacher participation in WaKIDS increased from 2,110 to 2,974. Although teacher participation increased by 864 teachers, the 2015-16 training demand was higher, due to annual teacher turnover: 1,280 teachers new to WaKIDS were trained in 2015. In addition, 164 teachers returning to WaKIDS attended a second training opportunity to deepen their understanding, bringing the total number of teachers trained in 2015 to 1,444.

One strength of the Washington approach has been its use of a common assessment tool, *GOLD™* by Teaching Strategies®, in its early learning and K-12 sectors. Although the two sectors use slightly different versions of the same tool, the shared language and data increase opportunities for cross-sector learning. In 2015, ECEAP and WaKIDS offered, for the first time, the opportunity for shared training among ECEAP and kindergarten teachers, where three WaKIDS trainers were co-licensed by Teaching Strategies to offer training to shared audiences. As WaKIDS and ECEAP expand, there will be more school districts and contractors that use *GOLD™* in both preschool and kindergarten classrooms. OSPI and DEL partner to support the ensuing dialogue and shared language about students' strengths.



### 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.

N/A

WASHINGTON DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA E(2) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION.

## 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>	36,367	42.6%
<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	76,095	44.5%
<b>Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry</b>	78,347	40.8%
<b>Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families</b>	190,809	42.5%

<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.

Data source for 2013 is 2012 American Communities Survey - Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS). Percentages and estimates are restricted to those for whom poverty status has been determined and includes children ages zero to four and those five year olds who were not in school.

Data source for 2014 is the 2013 American Communities Survey - Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS). Percentages and estimates are restricted to those for whom poverty status has been determined and includes children ages zero to four and those five year olds who were not in school.

Data source for 2015 is the 2014 American Communities Survey - Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS). Percentages and estimates are restricted to those for whom poverty status has been determined and includes children ages zero to four and those five year olds who were not in school.

**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>	17,222	3.5%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	145,500	30%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	14,060	2.9%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	2,838	0.6%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	15,629	7.4%
Are in foster care	4,075	0.8%
Other 1 as identified by the State	0	0%
<i>Describe:</i>		
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.

Denominator Notes: Census 2010 actual counts of population by single year of age without any indication as to whether the 5-year-olds are enrolled in school. The approach for calculating the denominator for the disabilities or developmental delays, migrant, homeless, and foster care percentages assume that half of 5-year-olds are enrolled; whereas a denominator of 482,932 was applied for 2013. The source of the 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 OFM estimates is the State Population Forecast (<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/stfc/default.asp>), updated annually in November.

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

Have disabilities or developmental delays: IDEA Part C Annual Reports (Dec 1, 2011-2015) and IDEA Part B Annual Report (Nov 1, 2010-2015).

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

Are English Language Learners: Data Source: 2011 ACS PUMS (estimate provided for 2012 and 2013); 2013 ACS PUMS (estimate for 2014); 2014 ACS PUMS (estimate for 2015).

Reside on "Indian Lands": Data for 2010 is used as an estimate for 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015. The ACS PUMS data is not updated for populations living on Tribal lands. Data for 2010 is Census Summary File 1 for children ages 0-5 (not able to exclude children enrolled in kindergarten) and using the geographical attribute "Indian reservations and trust lands."

Are migrant: Head Start Program Information Report (PIR) for program years 2010-2011 through 2014-2015 representing slots available for enrollment in Migrant/Seasonal Head Start which serves families who meet the Head Start eligibility guidelines and derive the majority of their income from agricultural work.

Head Start child counts are based on cumulative enrollment (total children served) while ECEAP is reporting funded enrollment (total funded program slots). Data is provided by the self-reported slot count from the Head Start Enterprise System Program Information Reporting system.

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

**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>			10,091	10,091
<i>Specify:</i>	ECEAP			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Early Learning Management System (ELMS) for SFY 2014-2015			
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	1,407	2,463	13,447	17,317
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Head Start Program Information Report (PIR) 2014-2015			
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	1,314	2,632	13,276	17,222
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	IDEA Part C Annual Report (Dec 1 of the program year): Count of Children Receiving			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>			402	402
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Data for program year 2015 is from the Comprehensive Education Data and Research			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	8,151	31,837	53,105	93,729
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	WCCC and SCC data extracted from SPSS database (Service Fiscal Year 2014-2015)			
<b>Other 1</b>	7,866	30,880	51,484	90,230
<i>Specify:</i>	Working Connections Child Care (WCCC)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	See above			
<b>Other 2</b>	285	957	1,621	2,863
<i>Specify:</i>	Seasonal Child Care (SCC)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	See above			
<b>Other 3</b>				636
<i>Specify:</i>	Homeless Child Care Program			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2015 HCCP Year End Report			
<b>Other 4</b>	784	2,023	1,707	4,514
<i>Specify:</i>	DSHS: Children's Administration (Child Care combined for these programs): *Child			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data An			
<b>Other 5</b>	1,400	1,797	1,713	4,910
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Multiple sources; see below			
<b>Other 6</b>	7,290			7,290
<i>Specify:</i>	First Steps			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	DSHS; 2014-15 SFY Medicaid Claim database			

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

<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>Other 7</b>	71,509	99,631	97,463	268,603
<i>Specify:</i>	Department of Health - AppleHealth/Medicaid services for infants and children			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis			
<b>Other 8</b>	3,958	7,592		11,550
<i>Specify:</i>	Department of Health Neuro-developmental Centers, Children Birth to 3 Yrs			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Department of Health Data collected on NDCs; SFY 2014-2015			

<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.

**Early Child Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP):** Funded enrollment from the ECEAP Management System (EMS) for 2011-12 and Early Learning Management System (ELMS) for 2012-13. # of Slots stayed constant for SFY 2013. Funded enrollment from the Early Learning Management System (ELMS) for 2013-14. ECEAP funded enrollment from the Early Learning Management System (ELMS) for 2014-15.

**Head Start:** Cumulative enrollment from the Head Start Enterprise System for the 2010-11 and 2011-12 program years. Note that Head Start child counts are based on cumulative enrollment (total children served) while ECEAP is reporting funded enrollment (total funded program slots). Data for funded enrollment is limited to the age range served (shown below), which is not at the level of specificity requested in the table. The Region 10 Office of Head Start provided data for HS and EHS, while data for AIAN and MSHS is the self-reported slot count from the Head Start Enterprise System Program Information Reporting.

Cumulative enrollment from the 2012-13 and 2013-14 Program Information Reports (PIR) - this is grantee self-reported data and may include some discrepancies. Note that Head Start child counts are based on cumulative enrollment (total children served) while ECEAP is reporting funded enrollment (total funded program slots). Data for funded enrollment is limited to the age range served (shown below), which is not at the level of specificity requested in the table. Lewis-Clark and Mid-Columbia Children's Council are located in Idaho and Oregon respectively but have slots in WA. These programs are not captured in WA state level PIR reports and therefore must be calculated separately and added in. Numbers for these programs are calculated based upon the percent of their slots in WA as applied to their total cumulative enrollment (these are estimates). Funded Enrollment is ACF funded enrollment. PIR reporting may include slots funded by other sources (which factor into the cumulative enrollment numbers) but we report ACF funded enrollment because other sources of slot funding are often things like ECEAP and therefore captured elsewhere. EHS cumulative enrollment numbers are based on children only. (EHS also serves pregnant women).

The decrease in 2014 enrollment of Head Start and Early Head Start children served is due to the fiscal impacts of the 2013 Sequester.

Cumulative enrollment from the 2014-15 Program Information Report (PIR). Migrant and Seasonal Numbers were calculated via percentages of the total enrollment.

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

**IDEA Parts C and B:** Data from the IDEA Part C Annual Reports (Dec 1 of the program year) and IDEA Part B Annual Report

(Nov 1 of the program year). \*Correction to data reported in the RTT-ELC application: IDEA Part B, program year 2011; was reported as 9,946.

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

**Title I of ESEA:** Data for program year 2011 from the 2010-2011 school year, district end-of-year Title I, Part A reports. Data for 2012 is the total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report. \*Correction to data reported in the RTT-ELC application: Title I, program year 2011; was reported as 3,260. Data for program year 2014 was from CEDARS and certified through the Title I, Part A end-of-year report. For this data year a new system was put into place, prepopulating data with the district's CEDARs submission. The district's data has been verified.

2015 data was pulled from Washington State's Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS). Data for 2014 was previously reported as 13,591 children; 2014 child counts were re-queried in on CEDARs in light of the 2015 results reported above, and because the result previously reported for the 2013 APR --742 children --was more consistent with 2015 results. The root cause of the previously reported value for 2014 could not be determined; the original analyst and script employed in the query could not be located or otherwise recreated.

**Programs receiving CCDF funding:** Note that this funding includes both ECEAP and WCCC programs. WCCC and Seasonal Child Care data from SSPS warrants in DEL Reporting. Data extracted by Service Fiscal Year, with the age of child calculated as of October 1, 2010 for SFY 2011, and October 1, 2011 for SFY 2012, etc. Preschool is selected as ages 3 through 5. The child counts represented in this program category are slightly higher than counts for the same category as stated in Table B4c2. Data for this category is based on actual number of children served and represents the full universe of children receiving services funded through CCDF programs, while Table B4c2 focuses exclusively on facilities and programs targeted for participation in TQRIS. Data for the Homeless Child Care Program (HCCP) represents an estimate of children served by the Homeless Child Care Program (HCCP), which provides short-term child care for parents that are not served by TANF-funded programs and who are participating in an HCCP-approved activity. Data is reported by number of service days from the contractors, Year End Report. Data is currently unavailable for Skagit County and SNSP (Spokane Neighborhood Action Partners).

Data for 2014 was previously reported as a total of 31,906 children (2,687 Infants <1; 7,888 Toddlers 1-2; 20,731 children 3-K entry; and 600 children in homeless child care). 2014 child counts were re-queried using the same script as employed for 2015, in light of the 2015 results reported above, and restated in the data table because the results previously reported for the years 2011-2103 (67,969, 50,507, and 50,124, respectively), are more consistent with the 2015 results. The root cause of the previously reported value for 2014 could not be determined; the original analyst and script employed in the query could not be located or otherwise recreated.

**Combined DSHS - Children's Administration Child Care Programs:** Programs under combined DSHS-CA Child Care include child care provided to foster children, child protective services (CPS) children, and Medicaid treatment (MTCC) children. The age of children was calculated as of January 1st of the fiscal year (January 1st 2011 for SFY2011, January 1st 2012 for SFY2012, etc.). Data from DSHS, Research and Data Analysis, Client Services Database (PEGASUS) analytical extract of 1/13/2016, representing the unduplicated number of children under five years olds served in one or more of those programs for at least one month during the fiscal year. Totals by year are shown below:

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

**Home Visiting.** Home Visiting represents total activity for the programs shown below:

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

Data Sources by Home Visiting Program:

**Parent Child Assistance Program (PCAP):** FY2011: Data represents those who participated 7/1/2010 -

6/30/2011. (Ages as of date of last participation or on June 30, 2011.) Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database, 6/30/2011. FY2012: Data represents those who participated 7/1/2011 - 6/30/2012. (Ages as of date of last participation or on June 30, 2012.) Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database, 6/30/2012.

PCAP is a 3 year home visitation program that generates evaluation data every June. For FY2014, data represents those who participated 7/1/2013 - 6/30/2014. (Ages as of date of last participation or on June 30, 2014.) Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database, 6/30/2013. For FY2015, data represents those who participated 7/1/2014 - 6/30/2015. (Ages as of date of last participation or on June 30, 2015). Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database, 6/30/2015.

**Parent-Child Home Program (PCHP):** FY2011: PCHP is a 2-year program that runs on a school-year calendar and serves families with children ages 2 and 3. Data for children in Yakima County provided by the PCHP regional coordinator and confirmed by program evaluator, Organizational Research Services for 2010-2011. Source: United Way of King County. FY2012: PCHP is a 2-year program that runs on a school-year calendar and serves families with children ages 2 and 3. Therefore, in this chart, children are included in both their first and second years of the program, as they were participating in those years. Source: Evaluation data prepared by Organizational Research Services for King County children from 2007 to 2010 and data from United Way of King County, confirmed by ORS for 2010-2011. Data source for children in Yakima County is PCHP regional coordinator. For FY2014, data source is the PCHP State Lead at PCHP National office. For 2015 data is for calendar year and was provided by the PCHP National office.

**Parents as Teachers (PAT):** FY2011: PAT is a universal home visiting model. PAT Affiliates are blended with Early Head Start home-based HV. High Needs Child counts are provided with the percentage of high needs to all children served. Source: PAT Annual Performance Report Summary for State Lead, July 2010 - June 2011 for each period. Data from PAT Tribal programs not available. FY2012: This information is taken from the PAT Affiliate Performance Report (APR) Summary for State Lead. Each Affiliate must compile data and complete the APR on an annual basis. Note the number of children served between July 2010 and June 2011 were considerably higher than this past year. New requirements from National PAT, including bi-weekly home visits for high risk families, transitioned into enrolling/targeting only youngest child in family but still providing screening, resources and other services to all children under age 3 in the family. The top numbers reflect all children in the individual family enrolled in program. For FY2014, data source of PAT State Lead at PAT National office. Data is for 2015. Infants under 1 include prenatal (84).

**STEEP - Parenting Partnership:** FY2011 and FY2012: The family graduates from the program when the child is around age 3. Data spans YTD for 2011-2014, provided by Thrive by Five Washington from the program's ETO database and the participant's electronic medical records. 2015 data provided by Thrive Washington. Data is a quarter snapshot from 2015 as a proxy. Demographic data is not reported out unduplicated at the end of the reporting year.

**Partnering with Families for Early Learning (PFEL):** PFEL serves women in their last trimester of pregnancy and continues up to the child's 2nd birthday. Data represents mothers that had at least one visit during FY2011. If the focus child was born before June 30, 2010, they are counted in ages 1-2 and are otherwise counted in Birth - 1 year. Source: Data provided by Thrive by Five Washington from the program's ETO database. For FY2014, data provided by program's ETO database. 2015 data provided by Thrive Washington - total includes 5 children with age unknown. Data is a quarter snapshot from 2015 as a proxy. Demographic data is not reported out unduplicated at the end of the reporting year.

**Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP):** Multiples are counted as individual children served. Age of child served calculated as Date of last visit - Baby DOB (months). Toddler data for FY2011 is estimated using FY2012 numbers. Source: NFP and Thrive by Five Washington. Data reported is for federal fiscal year 10/1/2014-9/30/2015.

**Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP):** CPP was funded in the Home Visiting Services Account (HVSA) in FY14. Data Source: CPP program client service records and Thrive by Washington. 2015 data provided by Thrive Washington. Data is a quarter snapshot from 2015 as a proxy. Demographic data is not reported out unduplicated at the end of the reporting year.

**Family Spirit (FS):** FS was funded in the Home Visiting Services Account (HVSA) in 2015 and is the Tribal home visiting demonstration project with the Colville tribe. Enrollment of families began in November of 2015.



**First Steps:** Data for 2010 is shown below, but was not included in the RTT-ELC application. Data from 2007 through 2009 from First Steps Database/Medicaid claims. Data reported for state fiscal years (July 1 - June 30). The number of infants on Medicaid who received at least one home visit through Infant Case Management or whose mothers received at least one postpartum home visit through Maternity Support Services during the specified time period. All infants were live born and had family incomes of up to and including 185 percent of the FPL. One infant may receive services and be counted in more than one year. Children are eligible for Infant Case Management only during the first year of life.

Data for 2010 through 2014: In 2010 Washington Medicaid's claims processing system changed. Prior to 2010, different procedure codes identified MSS home visits as opposed to office visits. In 2010 and later, the procedure codes changed and home visits can be identified only by a "place of service" variable. Represents the number of infant/mother dyads who received at least one home visit provided by postpartum Maternity Support Services or Infant Case Management during the stated year. There is a less than 1 percent missing data for place of service in both 2011 and 2012, although the data may change as claims are paid. Note that management of the First Steps program changed (subsequent to the RTT-ELC application) from DSHS to the Washington State Health Care Authority; however, DSHS provided data as presented in the 2013 and 2014 APR.

Data for 2015: reported participation based on calendar year ending 12/31/2015, whereas 2014 APR reported data is based on state fiscal year (July 1 - June 30). If based on the calendar year, then the reported value for 2014 would be 10,047.

**AppleHealth Medicaid Services for Infants and Children:** Represents an average for FY2011 of children ages 0-5 receiving Medicaid or Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Medicaid (Title 19) covers children up to 200 percent FPL. CHIP (Title 21) currently covers children between 200 percent to 300 percent of FPL, although these families or individuals pay part of the monthly premiums. Source: Washington Health Care Authority.

For 2014, Children ages 0-4 receiving Medicaid or Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). The age of children was calculated as of January 1st of the fiscal year (including January 1st 2013 for SFY2013 and January 1st 2014 for SFY2014). Data from DSHS, Research and Data Analysis, Client Services Database (PEGASUS) analytical extract of 2016-01-11, representing the unduplicated number of children under five served in one or more of those programs for at least one month during the fiscal year.

**Department of Health Neurodevelopmental Centers Serving Children Birth to 3 Years of Age:** DOH data is collected from the NDCs on the state fiscal year cycles. For 2011, data was collected between July 2010 to June 2011 and for 2012 from July 2011 to June 2012. For 2014, data was collected between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014. For 2015, data was collected between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015. Data is reflective of children birth to their third birthday. A breakdown of data is not available for the three to five age group.

**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	4,554	223	333	988	151	1,226	7,007
<i>Specify:</i>	ECEAP						
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	5,321	8,684	587	1,640	224	1,719	7,306
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	1,620	128	472	307	72	467	4,141
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	2,543	153	494	394	44	882	5,505
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	202	38	6	4	2	38	76
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	21,856	1,290	1,067	11,694	433	47	22,546
Other 1	857	254	12	258	13	941	2,149
<i>Describe:</i>	DSHS - Children's Administration – Child Care Combined for these programs: Child Protective Services						
Other 2	1,751	296	177	561	40	567	1,363
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting						
<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>	3,418	111	256	662	207	215	1,873
<i>Describe:</i>	First Steps						
<b>Other 4</b>	71,125	4,845	7,404	14,806	2,569	18,219	106,494
<i>Describe:</i>	Department of Health – AppleHealth/ Medicaid services for infants and children						
<b>Other 5</b>	2,435	245	560	558		801	5,334
<i>Describe:</i>	Department of Health - Neuro - Developmental Centers Children Birth to 3 Years of Age						
<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.

**Early Child Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP):** 2015 data from the Early Learning Management System (ELMS) for 2014-15, for all enrolled children. Families may choose more than one category, resulting in duplicate counts. For 3,955 children, families did not specify race, or selected “Other”.

**Head Start and Early Head Start:**

Cumulative enrollment from the 2014-15 Program Information Report (PIR) - this is grantee self-reported data and may include some discrepancies. Note that Head Start child counts are based on cumulative enrollment (total children served) by race/ethnicity, as funded enrollment (i.e. slots) for race/ethnicity does not exist. Note that Head Start and Early Head Start collect data on more racial categories than listed above, so certain categories were not included (“Other Race:” 1,357 clients; and “Unspecified Race:” 1,425 clients); the full data set of race/ethnicity categories is below. Also please note that Lewis-Clark and Mid-Columbia Children’s Council (MCCC) are located in Idaho and Oregon respectively but have slots in WA. These programs are not captured in WA state level PIR reports and therefore must be calculated separately and added in. Numbers for these programs are calculated based upon the percent of their slots in WA as applied to their total cumulative enrollment (these are estimates). Also please note that EHS data may include some pregnant women. Numbers for Lewis/Clark and MCCC are done by taking percentages of the total: MCCC HS (34 percent); MCCC EHS (45 percent); LC HS (6 percent); LC EHS (83

percent).

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

Migrant and Seasonal Numbers were calculated via percentages of the total enrollment. The PIR reporting system changed in 2015, which may explain some of the deviations from values reported in previous APRs.

**IDEA Part C:** Data from the IDEA Part C Annual Reports (Dec 1 of the program year).

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

**IDEA Part B:** Data from the IDEA Part B Annual Report (Nov 1 of the program year). Source of IDEA, part B, Section 619 is the November Federal Special Education Child Count.

**Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA:** Total number of children who receive Title I services. Note that students are counted once even if they were enrolled at multiple schools during the school year. Students are counted once regardless of how many Title I programs they were enrolled in at the time. 2015 data was pulled from Washington State's Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS).

**Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program.** The Homeless program began tracking ethnicity and demographic information in July of 2015. Average monthly numbers are based off of a reduced set of a number of months as opposed to being averaged over the course of a full year.

**Combined DSHS - Children's Administration Child Care Programs:** Programs under combined DSHS-CA Child Care include child care provided to foster children, child protective services (CPS) children, and Medicaid treatment (MTCC) children. The age of children was calculated as of January 1st of the fiscal year (January 1st 2011 for SFY2011, January 1st 2012 for SFY2012, etc.). Data from DSHS, Research and Data Analysis, Client Services Database (CSPROD) analytical extract of 2/9/2016, representing the unduplicated number of children under five years olds served in one or more of those programs for at least one month during the fiscal year. Totals by year are shown below:

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

**Home Visiting.** Home Visiting represents total activity for the programs shown below:

*Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.*

Data Sources by Home Visiting Program:

**Parent Child Assistance Program (PCAP):** Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database. PCAP is a 3 year home visitation program that generates evaluation data every June. For 2015, data presented is for children participating July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database. 6/30/2015.

**Parent-Child Home Program (PCHP):** PCHP is a 2-year program that runs on a school-year calendar and serves families with children ages 2 and 3. Therefore, in this chart, children are included in both their first and second years of the program, as they were participating in those years. Source: Evaluation data prepared by Organizational Research Services for King County children from 2007 to 2010 and data from United Way of King County, confirmed by ORS for 2010-2011. Data source for children in Yakima County is PCHP regional coordinator. For 2015 data is for calendar year and was provided by the PCHP National office.

**Parents as Teachers (PAT):** PAT is a universal home visiting model. PAT Affiliates are blended with Early Head Start home-based HV. High Needs Child counts are provided with the percentage of high needs to all children served. Source: PAT Annual Performance Report Summary for State Lead. Data from PAT Tribal programs not available. Each Affiliate must compile data and complete the APR on an annual basis. Note the number of children served between July 2010 and June 2011 were considerably higher than this past year. New requirements from National PAT, including bi-weekly home visits for high risk families, transitioned into enrolling/targeting only youngest child in family but still providing screening, resources and other services to all children under age 3 in the family. The top numbers reflect all children in the individual family enrolled in program. For 2015, data source is PAT state model lead through the PAT National office. PAT data is for state fiscal year July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015. \*88 children were marked as "other" or "unknown."

**STEEP - Parenting Partnership:** The family graduates from the program when the child is around age 3. Data provided by Thrive by Five Washington from the program's ETO database and the participant's electronic medical records, FY2011 -FY2014. 2015 data provided by Thrive Washington.

**Partnering with Families for Early Learning (PFEL):** PFEL serves women in their last trimester of pregnancy and continues up to the child's 2nd birthday. Data represents mothers that had at least one visit during FY2011. If the focus child was born before June 30, 2010, they are counted in ages 1-2 and are otherwise counted in Birth - 1 year. Source: Data provided by Thrive by Five Washington from the program's ETO database.

**Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP):** Multiples are counted as individual children served. Age of child served calculated as Date of last visit - Baby DOB (months). Source: NFP State lead and the NFP National Service Office and Thrive by Five Washington.

**Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP):** CPP was funded in the Home Visiting Services Account (HVSA) in FY14. Data Source: CPP program client service records and Thrive by Washington. 2015 data provided by Thrive Washington.

**Family Spirit (FS):** FS began enrolling children in November 2015.

Note: PFEL/CPP/STEEP data is a quarter snapshot from 2015 as a proxy. Demographic data is not reported out unduplicated at the end of the reporting year.

**First Steps.** Source: DSHS. 2015 Race/ethnicity numbers do not include 548 infants for whom race/ethnicity could not be determined. Included in the race/ethnicity numbers are 1,985 children with poorly specified race/ethnicity in claims, but who had Medicaid ID matches to the First Steps database where Mother's race/ethnicity was noted. For these children, mother's race/ethnicity was substituted for the unknown child race/ethnicity. Claims are as of January 2016; data may change as claims are added. 2015 reported amounts are based on the calendar year (January 1 - December 31).

**AppleHealth/Medicaid Services for Infants and Children.** Children ages 0-4 receiving Medicaid or Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). The age of children was calculated as of January 1st of the fiscal year.

For 2015, Data from DSHS, Research and Data Analysis, Client Services Database (PEGASUS) analytical extract of 2016-01-11, representing the unduplicated number of children under five served in one or more of those programs for at least one month during the fiscal year.

**Department of Health Neuro-developmental Centers Serving Children Birth to 3 Years of Age.** DOH data is collected from the NDCs on the state fiscal year cycles. For 2011, data was collected between July 2010 to June 2011, for 2012 between July 2011 to June 2012, for 2013 between July 2012 to June 2013, etc.

For 2015, the Department of Health does not require NDCs to break out kids served by race/ethnicity. However, the NDC data is included in the larger data set collected by DOH Children with Special Health Care Needs Coordinators in the local health jurisdictions through its CHIF (Child Health Intake Form) Automated System. This data is collected by calendar year; the last available full-year data report is for December 2014, which will be used as an estimate for FY2015. Please note that the race/ethnicity breakdown in this report does differ in some cases from the ethnicity categories in the table: Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander counts are included with Non-Hispanic Asian Children; in addition, there are an additional 2,553 children served by NDCs who fell in an "Other-None of the Above" category.

**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>	\$49,632	\$39,700	\$29,470	\$53,652	\$46,395
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$54,179,543	\$55,626,160	\$55,980,678	\$60,228,281	\$75,659,144
<i>Specify:</i>	ECEAP - State Funding; ECEAP - CCDF Match/MOE				
<b>State contributions to IDEA Part C</b>	\$41,668,121	\$41,668,121	\$41,668,121	\$41,668,121	\$41,668,121
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry</b>	\$58,474,849	\$60,700,269	\$62,003,520	\$71,949,326	\$75,947,624
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$72,872,519	\$74,901,005	\$72,650,137	\$84,272,754	\$75,375,124
<b>State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met</b>	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>	\$159,104,503	\$103,628,954	\$86,430,358	\$109,830,378	\$109,326,286
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>	\$34,608,113	\$34,608,113	\$5,835,065	\$8,672,084	\$8,443,000
<i>Specify:</i>	Child Care				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	\$1,570,665	\$3,707,847	\$5,611,629	\$7,914,313	\$10,829,293
<i>Specify:</i>	DEL				
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>	\$278,558,688	\$278,558,688	\$278,558,688	\$278,558,688	\$278,558,688
<i>Specify:</i>	Public programs segmented for children ages 0-5				
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>	\$16,414,715	\$16,414,715	\$16,414,715	\$16,414,715	\$16,414,715
<i>Specify:</i>	Private Support for Early Learning Initiatives				
<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>\$546,305,555</b>	<b>\$554,035,107</b>	<b>\$526,012,776</b>	<b>\$556,992,687</b>	<b>\$570,599,465</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.

All figures provided in Table A1-4 are based on the State's fiscal calendar, ending June 30th, and represent actual expenditures. Regarding updates to this table:

- Data that has been updated are indicated as such in the notes below.
- All other figures remain the same as reported in the RTT-ELC grant application.
- Figures that have not been updated are carried forward from SFY2011 to estimate funding for SFY2012-SFY2015 (e.g., for categories "Other State contributions - Public programs segmented for children ages 0-5" and "Other State contributions - Private Support for Early Learning Initiatives" above). In 2015, DEL planned to explore the opportunity to obtain this information in advance of the next APR window, thus giving the relevant large state agencies sufficient lead time to prepare a response, and retroactively update the report with all available years of data. This task was not completed in time for the 2015 APR; therefore, the assumption of carryforward, previously employed for SFY 2012-SFY 2014, was extended.

**Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start**

Source DEL. Represents funding by the Department of Early Learning in support of activities with the Head Start State Collaboration Office (HSSCO).

**State-funded preschool**

Source: DEL. Data reported for the Early Childhood Educational Assistance Program (ECEAP). Includes all ECEAP funds, including CCDF Match/MOE that are also counted in 'State contributions to CCDF.'

**State contributions to IDEA Part C**

Source: DSHS Children's Administration, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the Department of Health (DOH) for 2007 to 2010. Data for SFY2011 provided by DEL Program Administration for the Early Support for Infants and Toddlers. Data for SFY2011 does not include the Medicaid state match.

**State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry**

Source: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). Data for 2014-15 Special Education Allocation Records; Data for 2009-12 Special Education/finance-grants/funding website. Note that in SFY2006, Washington State categorized funding for Special Education for children in two segments: children ages 0-2 and ages 3-31. In SFY2007, funding for



children ages 0-Pre-K was identified and is able to be reported in two segments: children ages 0-2 and ages 3-pre-K.

### **Total State contributions to CCDF**

Sources: Department of Social and Health Services provided Match/MOE figures for ECEAP and Working Connections Child Care Programs. Note that ECEAP Match/MOE funds are also counted in 'State-funded preschool.'

The data for SFY13 and SFY14 includes disbursement and liquidation through December 2014. The data includes ESA state funding provided for CCDF Match/MOE for Working Connections Child Care Program, and state funding for both WCCC subsidy and administrative cost.

### **TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs**

Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Economic Services Division.

The data for SFY13 and SFY14 includes disbursement and liquidation through December 2014, and includes TANF transfer to CCDF and direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

### **Other State contributions - Child Care**

Source: DEL and DSHS

Figures represent related spending on child care within a number of programs, including:

- 1) Funds related to collective bargaining agreements with child care providers represented by SEIU 925.
- 2) Eligibility process and supports for homeless and seasonal child care, including child care grants and in-field staff to enable access to services. Note that services for Homeless and Seasonal Child Care are not included in child care subsidies from DSHS in 2007.
- 3) Child care through the Foster Parenting program, Child Protective Services, and the Medicaid Treatment program.

The data for SFY13 and SFY14 includes disbursement and liquidation through December 2014, and includes DSHS provided state funding for CCDF Match/MOE for DSHS other programs. The data includes ESA state funding provided for collective bargaining agreements with child care providers represented by SEIU925 and Tier reimbursement. Child care for Medicaid Treatment program was eliminated, thus this figure does not include this cost. The data does not include child care through the Foster Parenting program and Child Protective Services.

Note: The restated SFY13 and reported actual SFY14 figures are significant different than SFY11 and SFY12. The new data pull, which downwardly revised the previous 2013 estimate, suggested that original number might double efforts for eligibility staff (double counted in state contribution to CCDF and other state contributions). This report removed the double account.

### **Other State contributions - DEL**

Source: DEL. Other programs managed by the Department of Early Learning are organized around the areas of service as listed.

### **Other State contributions - Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment programs**

Source: Council for Families & Children Washington.

Funding supports include the following: home visitation programs focused on healthy parenting and child development, early literacy and school readiness; parent education programs that use a structure and curriculum to help parents develop parenting skills; parent support activities provide social supports to improve the environment in which to build positive parenting behaviors; and crisis nurseries offer respite care and support to families.

Figures that have not been updated are carried forward from SFY2011 to estimate funding for SFY2012-SFY2015. In 2015, DEL planned to explore the opportunity to obtain this information in advance of the next APR window, thus giving the relevant large state agencies sufficient lead time to prepare a response, and retroactively update the report with all available years of data. This task was not completed in time for the 2015 APR; therefore, the assumption of carryforward, previously employed for SF2012-SF2014, was extended.

#### **Other State contributions - Educational Research and Data Center (ERDC)**

SFY2011 is slightly under-reported. The final month, June 2011 is not included in SFY2011 due to federal reporting deadlines.

#### **Other State contributions - Maternal and Child Health Programs for families and children ages 0-5**

Source: Department of Health. Services provided to children ages 0-5, excluding expenses paid through Medicaid. Programs include Basic Food, Nutrition and Education (BFNEP) and Women Infant and Children (WIC), Child Health Profile and Immunizations, Child Behavioral Health, Oral and Hearing Health, and Maternal and Child Health programs.

Figures that have not been updated are carried forward from SFY2011 to estimate funding for SFY2012-SFY2015. In 2015, DEL planned to explore the opportunity to obtain this information in advance of the next APR window, thus giving the relevant large state agencies sufficient lead time to prepare a response, and retroactively update the report with all available years of data. This task was not completed in time for the 2015 APR; therefore, the assumption of carryforward, previously employed for SF2012-SF2014, was extended.

#### **Other State contributions - OSPI Programs for children ages 3-pre-K**

Source: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Programs include Assistance for English Language Learners, Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, Full-Day Kindergarten and alignment of programs and standards for children ages 3 through grade 3.

#### **Other State contributions - AppleHealth services for children ages 0 through5**

Source: Washington Health Care Authority (WHCA). SFY2011 expenditures are incomplete at this time.

Figures that have not been updated are carried forward from SFY2011 to estimate funding for SFY2012-SFY2015. In 2015, DEL planned to explore the opportunity to obtain this information in advance of the next APR window, thus giving the relevant large state agencies sufficient lead time to prepare a response, and retroactively update the report with all available years of data. This task was not completed in time for the 2015 APR; therefore, the assumption of carryforward, previously employed for SF2012-SF2014, was extended.

#### **Other State contributions - Private support for Early Learning Initiatives**

Sources: The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF), Thrive by Five Washington (Thrive) and Child Care Aware of Washington (CCA of WA), formerly the Washington State Child Care Resource and Referral Network.

Figures from BMGF represent a history of payments awarded by fiscal year within their Early Learning Initiative. Future payments for currently active grants are not included in this report.

Thrive's figures represent private sector investments (non-government, accrual basis). Note that grant/investments to Thrive included pledges restricted for future years - multi-year grants. Funding rolled over to subsequent years, depending on the private funder and the specificity outlined in the grant. This is most noticeable in SFY 2010, when approximately \$5 million was rolled over from the prior year.

Figures that have not been updated are carried forward from SFY2011 to estimate funding for SFY2012-SFY2015. In 2015, DEL planned to explore the opportunity to obtain this information in advance of the next APR window, thus giving the relevant large state agencies sufficient lead time to prepare a response, and retroactively update the report with all available years of data. This task was not completed in time for the 2015 APR; therefore, the assumption of carry forward, previously employed for SF2012-SF2014, was extended.

**Total State Contributions:** Total state contributions is calculated as the sum of the table totals, excluding TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs, and taking into consideration that the ECEAP - CCDF Match/MOE spending is reported twice (so one instance must be removed).

**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.

**Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program<sup>1</sup>**

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
<b>State-funded preschool</b> (annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)	8,024	8,391	8,391	8,741	10,091
<i>Specify:</i>	ECEAP				
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> (funded enrollment)	20,528	20,765	20,480	13,687	17,317
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> (annual December 1 count)	15,249	15,622	15,595	16,230	17,222
<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 )	3,374	2,556	742	371	402
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> (average monthly served)	67,969	50,507	50,124	95,377	93,729
<b>Other 1</b>	4,538	4,520	4,790	4,979	4,514
<i>Describe:</i>	DSHS - Children's Administration – Child Care Combined for these programs: Child Protective Services, Foster Parenting, M+				
<b>Other 2</b>	5,093	4,340	5,812	6,324	4,910
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting				
<b>Other 3</b>	15,117	11,837	11,947	10,303	7,290
<i>Describe:</i>	First Steps				
<b>Other 4</b>	103,727	275,341	271,007	267,309	268,603
<i>Describe:</i>	Department of Health – AppleHealth/ Medicaid services for infants and children				
<b>Other 5</b>	7,458	8,273	8,295	10,179	11,550
<i>Describe:</i>	Department of Health Neuro-developmental Centers Children Birth to 3 Yrs				
<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.

**Early Child Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP):** Funded enrollment from the ECEAP Management System (EMS) for

2011-12 and Early Learning Management System (ELMS) for 2012-13. # of Slots stayed constant for SFY 2013. Funded enrollment from the Early Learning Management System (ELMS) for 2013-14. ECEAP funded enrollment from the Early Learning Management System (ELMS) for 2014-15.

**Head Start:** Cumulative enrollment from the Head Start Enterprise System for the 2010-11 and 2011-12 program years. Note that Head Start child counts are based on cumulative enrollment (total children served) while ECEAP is reporting funded enrollment (total funded program slots). Data for funded enrollment is limited to the age range served (shown below), which is not at the level of specificity requested in the table. The Region 10 Office of Head Start provided data for HS and EHS, while data for AIAN and MSHS is the self-reported slot count from the Head Start Enterprise System Program Information Reporting. The decrease in 2014 enrollment of Head Start and Early Head Start children served is due to the fiscal impacts of the 2013 Sequester.

Cumulative enrollment from the 2014-15 Program Information Report (PIR). Migrant and Seasonal Numbers were calculated via percentages of the total enrollment.

Please see Supplementary Data Notes for Table (A)(1)-3a for the relevant table.

**IDEA Parts C and B:** Data from the IDEA Part C Annual Reports (Dec 1 of the program year) and IDEA Part B Annual Report (Nov 1 of the program year). \* Correction to IDEA Part B, program year 2011 as reported in the RTT-ELC application (9,946).

Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.

**Title I of ESEA:** Data for program year 2011 from the 2010-2011 school year, district end-of-year Title I, Part A reports. Data for 2012 and 2013 is the total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report. \*Correction to data reported in the RTT-ELC application: Title I, program year 2011 was reported as 3,260. Data for program year 2014 was from CEDARS and certified through the Title I, Part A end-of-year report. For this data year a new system was put into place, prepopulating data with the district's CEDARS submission. The district's data has been verified.

2015 data was pulled from Washington State's Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS). Data for 2014 was previously reported as 13,591 children; 2014 child counts were re-queried in on CEDARS in light of the 2015 results reported above, and because the result previously reported for the 2013 APR --742 children --was more consistent with 2015 results. The root cause of the previously reported value for 2014 could not be determined (the original analyst and script employed in the query could not be located or otherwise recreated).

**Programs receiving CCDF Funding:** Note that this funding includes both ECEAP and WCCC programs. WCCC and Seasonal Child Care data from SSPS warrants in DEL Reporting. Data extracted by Service Fiscal Year, with the age of child calculated as of October 1, 2010 for SFY 2011, October 1, 2011 for SFY 2012, and October 1, 2012 for SFY 2013. Preschool is selected as ages 3 through 5. The child counts represented in this program category are slightly higher than counts for the same category as stated in Table B4c2. Data for this category is based on actual number of children served and represents the full universe of children receiving services funded through CCDF programs, while Table B4c2 focuses exclusively on facilities and programs targeted for participation in TQRIS.

Data for the Homeless Child Care Program (HCCP) represents an estimate of children served by the Homeless Child Care Program (HCCP), which provides short-term child care for parents that are not served by TANF-funded programs and who are participating in an HCCP-approved activity. Data is reported by number of service days from the contractors, Year End Report. Data is currently unavailable for Skagit county and SNSP (Spokane Neighborhood Action Partners). 2013 correction to FY 2012 data: Data was unavailable for SNAP Contractor (Spokane Neighborhood Action Partners), but was available and included for the Skagit county contractor. Also, to clarify, data reported is the number of children authorized to participate in the program (derived from contractor service day data from the Year End Report. Note that child counts may include some school-age children.

Data for 2014 was previously reported as a total of 31,906 children (2,687 Infants <1; 7,888 Toddlers 1-2; 20,731 children 3-K entry; and 600 children in homeless child care). 2014 child counts were re-queried using the same script as employed for 2015, in light of the 2015 results reported above, and restated in the data table because the results previously reported for the years 2011-2103 (67,969, 50,507, and 50,124, respectively), are more consistent with the 2015 results. The root cause of the previously reported value for 2014 could not be determined; the original analyst and script employed in the query could not be located or otherwise recreated.

**Combined DSHS - Children's Administration Child Care Programs:** Programs under combined DSHS-CA Child Care include child care provided to foster children, child protective services (CPS) children, and Medicaid treatment (MTCC) children. The

age of children was calculated as of January 1st of the fiscal year (January 1st 2011 for SFY2011, January 1st 2012 for SFY2012, etc.). Data from DSHS, Research and Data Analysis, Client Services Database (PEGASUS) analytical extract of 1/13/2016, representing the unduplicated number of children under five years olds served in one or more of those programs for at least one month during the fiscal year. Totals by year are shown below:

Please see Supplementary Data Notes for Table (A)(1)-3a for the relevant table.

**Home Visiting.** Home Visiting represents total activity for the programs shown below:

Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.

Data Sources by Home Visiting Program:

**Parent Child Assistance Program (PCAP):** FY2011: Data represents those who participated 7/1/2010 - 6/30/2011. (Ages as of date of last participation or on June 30, 2011.) Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database, 6/30/2011. FY2012: Data represents those who participated 7/1/2011 - 6/30/2012. (Ages as of date of last participation or on June 30, 2012.) Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database, 6/30/2012.

PCAP is a 3 year home visitation program that generates evaluation data every June. For FY2014, data represents those who participated 7/1/2013 - 6/30/2014. (Ages as of date of last participation or on June 30, 2014.) Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database, 6/30/2013. For FY2015, data represents those who participated 7/1/2014 - 6/30/2015. (Ages as of date of last participation or on June 30, 2015). Source: C.C. Ernst, PCAP Program Evaluator, PCAP statewide database, 6/30/2015.

**Parent-Child Home Program (PCHP):** FY2011: PCHP is a 2-year program that runs on a school-year calendar and serves families with children ages 2 and 3. Data for children in Yakima County provided by the PCHP regional coordinator and confirmed by program evaluator, Organizational Research Services for 2010-2011. Source: United Way of King County. FY2012: PCHP is a 2-year program that runs on a school-year calendar and serves families with children ages 2 and 3. Therefore, in this chart, children are included in both their first and second years of the program, as they were participating in those years. Source: Evaluation data prepared by Organizational Research Services for King County children from 2007 to 2010 and data from United Way of King County, confirmed by ORS for 2010-2011. Data source for children in Yakima County is PCHP regional coordinator. For FY2014, data source is the PCHP State Lead at PCHP National office. For 2015 data is for calendar year and was provided by the PCHP National office.

**Parents as Teachers (PAT):** FY2011: PAT is a universal home visiting model. PAT Affiliates are blended with Early Head Start home-based HV. High Needs Child counts are provided with the percentage of high needs to all children served. Source: PAT Annual Performance Report Summary for State Lead, July 2010 - June 2011 for each period. Data from PAT Tribal programs not available. FY2012: This information is taken from the PAT Affiliate Performance Report (APR) Summary for State Lead. Each Affiliate must compile data and complete the APR on an annual basis. Note the number of children served between July 2010 and June 2011 were considerably higher than this past year. New requirements from National PAT, including bi-weekly home visits for high risk families, transitioned into enrolling/targeting only youngest child in family but still providing screening, resources and other services to all children under age 3 in the family. The top numbers reflect all children in the individual family enrolled in program. For FY2014, data source of PAT State Lead at PAT National office. Data is for 2015. Infants under 1 include prenatal (84).

**STEEP - Parenting Partnership:** FY2011 and FY2012: The family graduates from the program when the child is around age 3. Data spans YTD for 2011-2014, provided by Thrive by Five Washington from the program's ETO database and the participant's electronic medical records. 2015 data provided by Thrive Washington. Data is a quarter snapshot from 2015 as a proxy. Demographic data is not reported out unduplicated at the end of the reporting year.

**Partnering with Families for Early Learning (PFEL):** PFEL serves women in their last trimester of pregnancy and continues up to the child's 2nd birthday. Data represents mothers that had at least one visit during FY2011. If the focus child was born before June 30, 2010, they are counted in ages 1-2 and are otherwise counted in Birth - 1 year. Source: Data provided by Thrive by Five Washington from the program's ETO database. For FY2014, data provided by program's ETO database. 2015 data provided by Thrive Washington - total includes 5 children with age unknown. Data is a quarter snapshot from 2015 as a proxy.

Demographic data is not reported out unduplicated at the end of the reporting year.

**Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP):** Multiples are counted as individual children served. Age of child served calculated as Date of last visit - Baby DOB (months). Toddler data for FY2011 is estimated using FY2012 numbers. Source: NFP and Thrive by Five Washington. Data reported is for federal fiscal year 10/1/2014-9/30/2015.

**Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP):** CPP was funded in the Home Visiting Services Account (HVSA) in FY14. Data Source: CPP program client service records and Thrive by Washington. 2015 data provided by Thrive Washington. Data is a quarter snapshot from 2015 as a proxy. Demographic data is not reported out unduplicated at the end of the reporting year.

**Family Spirit:** FS was funded in the Home Visiting Services Account (HVSA) in 2015 and is the Tribal home visiting demonstration project with the Colville tribe. Enrollment of families began in November of 2015.

**First Steps:** Data for 2010 is shown below, but was not included in the RTT-ELC application. Data from 2007 through 2009 from First Steps Database/Medicaid claims. Data reported for state fiscal years (July 1 - June 30). The number of infants on Medicaid who received at least one home visit through Infant Case Management or whose mothers received at least one postpartum home visit through Maternity Support Services during the specified time period. All infants were live born and had family incomes of up to and including 185 percent of the FPL. One infant may receive services and be counted in more than one year. Children are eligible for Infant Case Management only during the first year of life.

Data for 2010 through 2012: In 2010 Washington Medicaid's claims processing system changed. Prior to 2010, different procedure codes identified MSS home visits as opposed to office visits. In 2010 and later, the procedure codes changed and home visits can be identified only by a "place of service" variable. Represents the number of infant/mother dyads who received at least one home visit provided by postpartum Maternity Support Services or Infant Case Management during the stated year. There is a less than 1 percent missing data for place of service in both 2011 and 2012, although the data may change as claims are paid.

Please see Supplementary Data Notes for the relevant table.

Note that management of the First Steps program changed (subsequent to the RTT-ELC application) from DSHS to the Washington State Health Care Authority; however, DSHS provided data as presented in the 2012 APR.

2013 Data Notes: Data source unchanged.

2014 Data Notes: Data source unchanged.

Data for 2015: reported participation based on calendar year ending 12/31/2015, whereas 2014 APR reported data is based on state fiscal year (July 1 - June 30). If based on the calendar year, then the reported value for 2014 would be 10,047.

**AppleHealth Medicaid Services for Infants and Children:** SFY 2011-SFY 2013 Data Notes:

For consistency the numbers for SFY 2011 (July 2010 through June 2011) and SFY 2012 (July 2011 through June 2012) were recalculated using the same method that was used for the SFY 2013 (July 2012 through June 2013) data. The data represent the unduplicated number of children under five years of age receiving Medicaid or Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) during the fiscal year. Medicaid (Title 19) covers children up to 200 percent FPL. CHIP (Title 21) currently covers children between 200 percent to 300 percent of FPL, although these families or individuals pay part of the monthly premiums. The age of children was calculated as of January 1st of the fiscal year (January 1, 2011 for SFY2011, January 1, 2012 for SFY2012, and January 1, 2013 for SFY2013). Data Source: Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis, Client Services Database (PEGASUS) analytical extract of 01/10/2014.

For 2014, Children ages 0-4 receiving Medicaid or Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). The age of children was calculated as of January 1st of the fiscal year (including January 1st 2013 for SFY2013 and January 1st 2014 for SFY2014). Data from DSHS, Research and Data Analysis, Client Services Database (PEGASUS) analytical extract of 2016-01-11, representing the unduplicated number of children under five served in one or more of those programs for at least one month during the fiscal year.

**Department of Health Neurodevelopmental Centers Serving Children Birth to 3 Years of Age:** DOH data is collected from the NDCs on the state fiscal year cycles. For 2011, data was collected between July 2010 to June 2011; for 2012 from July



2011 to June 2012; and for 2013 from July 2012 to June 2013. For 2014, data was collect between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014. For 2015, data was collect between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015. Data is reflective of children birth to their third birthday. A breakdown of data is not available for the three to five age group.

**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.

N/A

**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
<b>State-funded preschool</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	X	X	X		X
<b>Programs funded by IDEA, Part C</b>	X	X			
<b>Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619</b>		X			X
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>					
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b>	X	X	X	X	
<b>Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)</b>			X	X	
<b>Tier 1</b>					
<b>Tier 2</b>					
<b>Tier 3</b>			X	X	
<b>Tier 4</b>			X	X	
<b>Tier 5</b>			X	X	
<b>State licensing requirements</b>					
<b>Other 1</b>	X	X			
<i>Describe:</i>	State-funded Home-Visiting				
<b>Other 2</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 3</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 4</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 5</b>					
<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.

N/A

## 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.

Washington State expended \$51.9m in 2015. When compared to the \$49.9m total projected budget, the project overspent its projection by \$2m. DEL increased its overall expenditures from the \$44.4m in 2014 to \$51.9m in 2015. Actual grant funds remain under spent by \$9.4m through the end of 2015. This figure is inclusive of the \$3.9m DEL requested for our no cost extension. DEL incurred actual expenses of \$18.9m in RTT funds versus an annual projected budget of \$24.4m for the fourth year of the grant. This variance was significantly offset by expenditures from other funding sources. DEL incurred actual expenditures of \$33m in other funding sources versus a projected budget of \$25.6m, resulting in a negative variance of \$7.4m.

The reasons behind the imbalance on a project-by-project basis are explained in the fiscal narrative for each of the sub-projects. Overall, the variance in expenditures against the budget and financing is accounted for by the passage of the historic legislation, known as the Early Start Act, halfway through the 2015 calendar year. Due to the passage of the Early Start Act, DEL had significant increases in other dollars contributing to the work of the RTT-ELC projects. As noted in the previous APR, DEL worked closely with the state legislature during the 2015 session to expand the reach of RTT-ELC efforts to cover all children receiving subsidy. DEL must spend all general -fund state dollars within the fiscal year (July, 2015 - June, 2016) or return them to the state. As Washington State transitions from a voluntary TQRIS to a mandatory one, we continue to focus on implementing a financing strategy that builds sustainability and leverages all available resources as a result of the Early Start Act.

Looking at the RTT-ELC work overall, the transition to state funding demonstrates Washington's ability to take what were seen as RTT-ELC grant projects, bring them to scale, and create sustainable programming that supports Washington's children, families, and early learning providers. To date, DEL has invested \$153 million dollars, \$2 million over our anticipated commitment of \$151m. This again speaks to Washington's commitment to program sustainability and the state's ability to leverage resources.

### Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

Following the submission of the 2015 APR, DEL will submit an addendum to our original no cost extension (early March, 2016). As DEL moves from a voluntary to a mandatory system we will continue to monitor costs and utilize financing strategies to spend all RTT dollars while leveraging other funding sources.

## Project Budget 1

**Project Name: Grants 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.

Total project expenditures for this category were \$451k in 2015, which represented a positive variance of \$67k, against a total budget of \$581k. The primary discrepancy for this variance is due to required RTT technical assistance funds that DEL continues to hold in reserve to be spent on state technical assistance and state membership with the BUILD Initiative, as approved by Washington's RTT-ELC federal program officers. Funds will continue to be expended through a contract with BUILD.

### 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 Technical Assistance (TA) funds are the only funds that will remain in this project in calendar year 2016. DEL anticipates fully spending down the remaining RTT-ELC TA balance of \$95k. DEL will continue its work with BUILD on technical assistance related to early learning workforce development, standards alignment, and an innovating funding strategy around Early Head Start Child Care Partnership sites participating in Early Achievers.

Due to the passage of the Early Start Act, DEL had significant increases in other dollars contributing to the work of the RTT-ELC projects. As noted in the previous Annual Performance Report (APR), DEL worked closely with the state legislature during the 2015 session to expand the reach of RTT-ELC efforts to cover all children receiving subsidy. DEL must spend all general -fund state dollars within the fiscal year (July, 2015 - June, 2016) or return them to the state. DEL continues to implement a financing strategy that builds sustainability and leverages all resources now that the Early Start Act has passed.

## Project Budget 2

**Project Name:** TQRIS Expansion

---

### 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.

In 2015, DEL and its partners expended a total of \$41.6m against a budget of \$41.6m. This project represents the work done in the field to establish and expand the statewide quality rating system and represents the lion's share of funding among the grant's 5 projects. Total expenditures for this project represents a slight negative variance of \$73k. DEL requested \$19m in RTT-ELC funds for this project, and expended \$15m in RTT funds. While RTT funds were under spent in this area, the total funds expended were on target with our projections.

Areas of RTT underspend include Ratings and Monitoring, Training Hub Incentives, Scholarships, and Coach Training, Rating Readiness Training, and EA Institutes. Underspend in RTT dollars in these areas can be attributed to slower than anticipated ramp-up and a natural transition period from a voluntary to a mandatory statewide TQRIS. This transition occurred for DEL, our partners, and providers in the field. DEL was conscious that it was important to transition in a way that supported its partners and providers to be successful. In addition, some underspending can be attributed to a lag in billing, thus services rendered in December had not yet been billed for at the close of the calendar year's expenditures.

There were also areas of overspend in other dollars including Coaching, Technical Assistance, and other expansion activities related to providing resources to providers. The reasons behind this overspend are related to costs associated with moving from a voluntary to a mandatory system of Early Achievers participation. Increases were seen in building the infrastructure, technical assistance, coaching, and rating readiness activities needed to ensure providers successfully navigate Early Achievers and meet the rating deadlines mandated by the Early Start Act.

DEL's ultimate goal is to fully expend the resources afforded to it for the success, growth, and sustainability of the statewide TQRIS, while maintaining flexibility within the three funding sources: RTT, state general fund, and the Child Care Development fund. Each fund has a different timeline and considerations. DEL expended the expected budgeted amount within this project in aggregate; variation, however, exists by expense line item where different funding sources are strategically used.

### 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.

As noted in the 2014 APR, changes in this budget occurred in 2015 and spending will continue into 2016 as Early Achievers is scaled, moving from a voluntary to mandatory system, and implementing policies such as remedial activities, needs based grants, re-rating, and engagement protocol. There could also be changes to this budget as the next iteration of Early Achievers is implemented. As the work to refresh Early Achievers is underway, DEL does not yet know the impact of any changes related to streamlining the Early Achievers process to ensure all quality standards have a positive impact on child outcomes.

Due to the passage of the Early Start Act, DEL had significant increases in other dollars contributing to the work of the RTT-ELC projects. As noted in the previous APR, DEL worked closely with the state legislature during the 2015 session to expand the reach of RTT-ELC efforts to cover all children receiving subsidy. DEL must spend all general -fund state dollars within the state fiscal year (July, 2015 - June, 2016) or return them to the state. DEL continues to implement a financing strategy that builds sustainability and leverages all resources now that the Early Start Act has passed.



## Project Budget 3

**Project Name:** TQRIS Infrastructure

---

### 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.

DEL has expended \$6.6m in TQRIS Infrastructure for 2015. This project is currently overspent by \$2m, when compared to the projected budget of \$4.6m. There was a small positive variance (approximately \$200,000) in RTT funds, and a negative variance of \$2.1m in other funds. The two biggest drivers of this variance are IT capital and increases in the infrastructure of the DEL Quality Practice and Professional Growth (QPPG), Division as a result of the passage of the Early Start Act; the QPPG Division does not utilize any RTT dollars to fund staff and has always drawn from other funding sources. DEL continues to work on our IT systems and creating better linkages across multiple systems, as noted in the previous APR.

### 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.

DEL has an approved \$1.3m in no cost extension funds in this category (\$500k for the online portal project and another \$800k to the project overall). DEL intentionally asked for these dollars; this project connects to support the in the field work of the sub-projects in TQRIS Expansion. DEL does not anticipate increasing the approved \$1.3m in our upcoming addendum.

## Project Budget 4

**Project Name: WaKids**

---

### 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.

DEL and its WaKIDS implementation partner, the Office of Superintendent for Public Instruction (OSPI) realized actual expenditures of \$555k against a projected \$1.0m budget for teacher training, 100 percent RTT funded. This represents a positive variance of \$495k. This underspend should not diminish the good work done in this area. Funding was used primarily to support teacher training for WaKIDS. A significant portion of the training introduced teachers to observational assessment and Washington's KEA, *GOLD™* by Teaching Strategies®. In 2015, 1,280 teachers new to WaKIDS completed the two-day introductory training and 164 returning teachers completed the optional three hours of advanced training. OSPI reached 74 percent of all kindergarteners in the state. 87 percent of Washington's school districts now have one or more schools participating in WaKIDS, an increase of almost 20 percent from last year.

OSPI's spending to support teacher training and other WaKIDS activities is also included in this project. In 2015, OSPI expended \$1.6m (which includes funds from other sources) against a budget of \$0.5m.

### 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.

WaKIDS is not a project covered under the DEL no-cost extension. The legislature is projected to fully fund full-day kindergarten for all students in the 2016-17 school year, and DEL has planned to provide other funding for teacher training and child assessments as part of this work.

## Project Budget 5

**Project Name: Professional Development**

---

### 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.

As noted in the 2014 APR, Professional Development is a project in which Washington continues to underspend. In 2015, the state expended \$1m against a budget of \$1.6m, leaving a positive variance of \$0.6m. As noted in the previous APR, DEL did work to streamline the degree verification and incentives process. Variances in the budget are a result of switching to the new streamlined system, as well as the transition to general fund state dollars.

### 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.

This is not an activity covered under the no-cost extension. Any remaining funds in this project will be shifted to approved activities under the no-cost extension and included in the March, 2016 no-cost extension addendum. The state legislature recognized this project as part of the Early Start Act.

## Project Budget 6

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 WASHINGTON RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 5 PROJECTS.  
PAGES 93-116 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	\$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	\$273,277.17	\$1,591,276.12	\$2,175,232.19	\$2,124,082.72	\$6,163,868.20
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$1,093,031.40	\$1,428,318.47	\$883,748.80	\$3,405,098.67
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$273,277.17	\$2,684,307.52	\$3,603,550.66	\$3,007,831.52	\$9,568,966.87
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.	\$4,412,197.54	\$8,924,871.60	\$10,508,422.71	\$15,606,334.49	\$39,451,826.34
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$298,801.42	\$519,958.30	\$484,995.33	\$304,859.39	\$1,608,614.44
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$4,984,276.13	\$12,129,137.42	\$14,596,968.70	\$18,919,025.40	\$50,629,407.65
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$17,992,855.65	\$22,317,764.28	\$29,832,605.16	\$33,027,611.19	\$103,170,836.28
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$22,977,131.78	\$34,446,901.70	\$44,429,573.86	\$51,946,636.59	\$153,800,243.93

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 - Overall Grants 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	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$298,801.42	\$519,958.30	\$484,995.33	\$304,859.39	\$1,608,614.44
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$298,801.42	\$519,958.30	\$484,995.33	\$304,859.39	\$1,608,614.44
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$124,782.35	\$92,583.00	\$146,372.86	\$363,738.21
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$298,801.42	\$644,740.65	\$577,578.33	\$451,232.25	\$1,972,352.65

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 Expansion**

<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.	\$4,412,197.54	\$8,389,832.76	\$9,688,045.68	\$15,050,615.59	\$37,540,691.57
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)	\$4,412,197.54	\$8,389,832.76	\$9,688,045.68	\$15,050,615.59	\$37,540,691.57
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$13,821,362.48	\$18,580,027.74	\$22,628,757.75	\$26,637,032.34	\$81,667,180.31
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$18,233,560.02	\$26,969,860.50	\$32,316,803.43	\$41,687,647.93	\$119,207,871.88

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 - TQRIS Infrastructure**

<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	\$273,277.17	\$1,591,276.12	\$2,175,232.19	\$2,124,082.72	\$6,163,868.20
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)	\$273,277.17	\$1,591,276.12	\$2,175,232.19	\$2,124,082.72	\$6,163,868.20
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	\$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)	\$273,277.17	\$1,591,276.12	\$2,175,232.19	\$2,124,082.72	\$6,163,868.20
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$2,791,880.21	\$1,682,056.72	\$5,288,565.46	\$4,488,204.99	\$14,250,707.38
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$3,065,157.38	\$3,273,332.84	\$7,463,797.65	\$6,612,287.71	\$20,414,575.58

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 - WaKIDS - Kindergarten Readiness**

<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	\$535,038.84	\$820,377.03	\$555,718.90	\$1,911,134.77
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	\$535,038.84	\$820,377.03	\$555,718.90	\$1,911,134.77
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,379,612.96	\$1,735,910.25	\$1,507,592.03	\$1,629,153.45	\$6,252,268.69
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$1,379,612.96	\$2,270,949.09	\$2,327,969.06	\$2,184,872.35	\$8,163,403.46

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 - Professional Development Incentives**

<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	\$1,093,031.40	\$1,428,318.47	\$883,748.80	\$3,405,098.67
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$1,093,031.40	\$1,428,318.47	\$883,748.80	\$3,405,098.67
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	\$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. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$1,093,031.40	\$1,428,318.47	\$883,748.80	\$3,405,098.67
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$194,987.22	\$315,106.92	\$126,847.55	\$636,941.69
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$1,288,018.62	\$1,743,425.39	\$1,010,596.35	\$4,042,040.36

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.

**RTT-ELC Supplementary Data Notes (Tables) for Annual Performance Report 2015:**

**Table (B)(2)(c) Data Notes:**

Programs receiving from CCDF funds:

The total subsidized facilities based on active licensed facilities as of 12/31/2012 is 4,163. Calculations are shown below:

Licensed Facility Type	Total 12/31/2012	Subsidized Program %	Subsidized Facilities
Child Care Centers	1,553	77%	1,200
Family Child Care Homes	4,363	68%	2,962
<b>Total Facilities</b>	<b>5,916</b>		<b>4,163</b>

The total subsidized facilities based on active licensed facilities as of 12/31/2013 is 3,696. Calculations are shown below:

Licensed Facility Type	Total 12/31/2013	Subsidized Program %	Subsidized Facilities
Child Care Centers	1,477	79%	1,167
Family Child Care Homes	3,989	63.4%	2,529
<b>Total Facilities</b>	<b>5,466</b>		<b>3,696</b>

The total subsidized facilities based on active licensed facilities as of 12/31/2014 is 3,609. Calculations are shown below:

Licensed Facility Type	Total 12/31/2014	Subsidized Program %	Subsidized Facilities
Child Care Centers	1,486	79%	1,174
Family Child Care Homes	3,840	63.4%	2,435
<b>Total Facilities</b>	<b>5,326</b>		<b>3,609</b>

The total subsidized facilities based on active licensed facilities as of 12/31/2015 is 3,461. Calculations are shown below:

Licensed Facility Type	Total 12/31/2015	Subsidized Program %	Subsidized Facilities
Child Care Centers	1,496	79.4%	1,188
Family Child Care Homes	3,678	61.8%	2,273
<b>Total Facilities</b>	<b>5,174</b>		<b>3,461</b>

**RTT-ELC Supplementary Data Notes (Tables) for Annual Performance Report 2015:**

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

Denominator Notes:

Census 2010 actual counts of population by single year of age without any indication as to whether the 5-year-olds are enrolled in school. The approach for calculating the denominator for the disabilities or developmental delays, migrant, homeless, and foster care percentages assume that half of 5-year-olds are enrolled; whereas a denominator of 482,932 was applied for 2013. The source of the 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 OFM estimates is the State Population Forecast (<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/stfc/default.asp>), updated annually in November.

	Census 2010	2010 Allocation	2011 OFM Estimate	2011 Allocation	2012 OFM Estimate	2012 Allocation	2013 OFM Estimate	2013 Allocation
Under 1 year of age	87,016	87,016	85,957	85,957	86,414	86,414	87,095	87,095
1 year	87,607	87,607	87,026	87,026	86,063	86,063	87,026	87,026
2 years	89,399	89,399	87,715	87,715	87,292	87,292	86,653	86,653
3 years	89,097	89,097	89,513	89,513	87,982	87,982	87,873	87,873
4 years	86,538	86,538	89,210	89,210	89,778	89,778	88,547	88,547
5 years	86,550	43,275	86,637	43,319	89,451	44,726	90,304	45,152
Children ages 0-5	526,207	482,932	526,058	482,740	526,980	482,255	527,498	482,346
Children ages 3-4		175,635		178,723		177,760		176,420

	2014 OFM Estimate	2014 Allocation	2015 OFM Estimate	2015 Allocation
Under 1 year of age	87,292	87,292	87,950	87,950
1 year	87,446	87,446	86,882	86,882
2 years	88,150	88,150	88,210	88,210
3 years	87,754	87,754	88,870	88,870
4 years	88,951	88,951	88,419	88,419
5 years	89,535	44,768	89,598	44,799
Children ages 0-5	529,128	484,361	529,929	485,130
Children ages 3-4		176,705		177,289

Have disabilities or developmental delays:

IDEA Part C Annual Reports (Dec 1, 2011-2015) and IDEA Part B Annual Report (Nov 1, 2010-2015).

\*Correction to IDEA Part B, program year 2011 as reported in the RTT-ELC application (9,946).

IDEA Parts B and C	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
IDEA Part C: Birth to age 3	5,592	5,567	5,814	6,080	6,529	7,207
IDEA Part B: Age 3 to Pre-K	9,681	9,682*	9,808	9,515	9,701	10,015
<b>Children ages 0-5</b>	<b>15,273</b>	<b>15,249</b>	<b>15,622</b>	<b>15,595</b>	<b>16,230</b>	<b>17,222</b>

**RTT-ELC Supplementary Data Notes (Tables) for Annual Performance Report 2015:**

Are migrant:

Head Start Program Information Report (PIR) for program years 2010-2011 through 2014-2015 representing slots available for enrollment in Migrant/Seasonal Head Start which serves families who meet the Head Start eligibility guidelines and derive the majority of their income from agricultural work.

Head Start child counts are based on cumulative enrollment (total children served) while ECEAP is reporting funded enrollment (total funded program slots). Data is provided by the self-reported slot count from the Head Start Enterprise System Program Information Reporting system.

Fiscal Year	FY2010	FY2011	FY2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
<b>MSHS Enrolled</b>	3,667	3,570	3,666	3,666	3,634	2,798	<b>2,838</b>

Are homeless:

The count of children ages birth through 5 (as of June of the SFY) receiving DSHS economic services who are shown as “homeless” at some point during the state fiscal year, which runs July-June. The “total” is the number of children receiving economic services with the percent homeless taken from that number. These data were drawn from the DSHS Integrated Client Database (ICDB). Data on homelessness was obtained from the DSHS Automated Client Eligibility System (ACES) maintained by the DSHS Economic Services Administration (DSHS-ESA). In 2015, DSHS implemented an improvement to the homeless indicator process. SFY 2015 data reflects the new process. Prior years are not restated and reflect the previous process employed.

Fiscal Year	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Total Children to age 5</b>	187,932	213,825	241,391	253,404	255,005	250,609	241,539	210,076
<b>Homeless Families</b>	12,326	13,014	13,855	15,542	16,177	17,125	16,191	15,629
<b>% Homeless</b>	6.56%	6.09%	5.74%	6.13%	6.34%	6.83%	6.70%	7.44%

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

Head Start:

Cumulative enrollment from the Head Start Enterprise System for the 2010-11 and 2011-12 program years. Note that Head Start child counts are based on cumulative enrollment (total children served) while ECEAP is reporting funded enrollment (total funded program slots). Data for funded enrollment is limited to the age range served (shown below), which is not at the level of specificity requested in the table. The Region 10 Office of Head Start provided data for HS and EHS, while data for AIAN and MSHS is the self-reported slot count from the Head Start Enterprise System Program Information Reporting.

Cumulative enrollment from the 2012-13 and 2013-14 Program Information Reports (PIR) - this is grantee self-reported data and may include some discrepancies. Note that Head Start child counts are based on cumulative enrollment (total children served) while ECEAP is reporting funded enrollment (total funded program slots). Data for funded enrollment is limited to the age range served (shown below), which is not at the level of specificity requested in the table. Lewis-Clark and Mid-Columbia Children's Council are located in Idaho and Oregon respectively but have slots in WA. These programs are not captured in WA state level PIR reports and therefore must be calculated separately and added in. Numbers for these programs are calculated based upon the percent of their slots in WA as applied to their total cumulative enrollment (these are estimates). Funded Enrollment is ACF funded enrollment. PIR reporting may include slots funded by other sources (which factor into the cumulative enrollment numbers) but we report ACF funded enrollment because other sources of slot funding are often things like ECEAP and therefore captured elsewhere. EHS cumulative enrollment numbers are based on children only (EHS also serves pregnant women).

The decrease in 2014 enrollment of Head Start and Early Head Start children served is due to the fiscal impacts of the 2013 Sequester.

**RTT-ELC Supplementary Data Notes (Tables) for Annual Performance Report 2015:**

Cumulative enrollment from the 2014-15 Program Information Report (PIR). Migrant and Seasonal Numbers were calculated via percentages of the total enrollment.

Program Type	2010-2011 Funded Enrollment		2011-2012 Funded Enrollment		2012-2013 Funded Enrollment		2013-2014 Funded Enrollment		2014-2015 Funded Enrollment	
	EHS Ages 0-3	HS Ages 3-5	EHS Ages 0-3	HS Ages 3-5	EHS Ages 0-3	HS Ages 3-5	EHS Ages 0-3	HS Ages 3-5	EHS Ages 0-3	HS Ages 3-5
Region 10	569	9,699	2,511	9,834	2,518	10,871	3,734	10,271	2,467	9,667
AIAN	204	1,075	267	1,074	341	1,074	390	1,204	343	1,102
MSSH	3,570		3,666		2,957		1,012	1,155	1,767	1,071
<b>Totals</b>	<b>15,117</b>		<b>17,352</b>		<b>17,761</b>		<b>5,136</b>	<b>12,630</b>	<b>4,577</b>	<b>11,840</b>

**IDEA Parts C and B:**

Data from the IDEA Part C Annual Reports (Dec 1 of the program year) and IDEA Part B Annual Report (Nov 1 of the program year).

IDEA Part C Age Segments	2014	2015
Children < 1 yr	1,126	1,314
Children age >= 1 yr and < 2 yr	2,284	2,632
Children 2 – 3 yrs	3,119	3,261
<b>Totals</b>	<b>6,529</b>	<b>7,207</b>
<b>IDEA Part B</b>		
Children ages 3-kindergarten entry	9,701	10,015
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>16,230</b>	<b>17,222</b>

**Combined DSHS – Children’s Administration Child Care Programs:**

Programs under combined DSHS-CA Child Care include child care provided to foster children, child protective services (CPS) children, and Medicaid treatment (MTCC) children. The age of children was calculated as of January 1st of the fiscal year (January 1st 2011 for SFY2011, January 1st 2012 for SFY2012, etc.). Data from DSHS, Research and Data Analysis, Client Services Database (PEGASUS) analytical extract of 1/13/2016, representing the unduplicated number of children under five years olds served in one or more of those programs for at least one month during the fiscal year. Totals by year are shown below:

Fiscal Year	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3-4	Total
2011	747	2,022	1,762	4,531
2012	846	1,921	1,746	4,513
2013	918	2,031	1,854	4,803
2014	955	2,188	1,836	4,979
2015	784	2,023	1,707	4,514

**RTT-ELC Supplementary Data Notes (Tables) for Annual Performance Report 2015:**

Home Visiting:

Home Visiting represents total activity for the programs shown below:

Home Visiting Programs	FY2014				FY2015			
	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Pre-K Ages 3 to K entry	Total	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Pre-K Ages 3 to K entry	Total
Parent Child Assistance Program	317	648	166	1,131	594	369	263	1,226
Parent Child Home Program (PCHP)	0	454	638	1,092	0	144	1,012	1,156
Parents as Teachers (PAT)	654	889	275	1,818	554	1,006	406	1,966
STEEP; Parenting Partnership	25	35	19	71	7	13	25	45
Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP)	1,228	928	0	2,156	216	247	N/A	463
Partnering with Families for Early Learning (PFEL)	27	35	0	44	27	13	2	42
Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP)	4	8	0	12	1	3	5	9
Family Spirit					1	2	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,255</b>	<b>2,997</b>	<b>1,098</b>	<b>6,324</b>	<b>1,400</b>	<b>1,797</b>	<b>1,713</b>	<b>4,910</b>

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

Head Start and Early Head Start:

Cumulative enrollment from the 2013-14 Program Information Report (PIR) - this is grantee self-reported data and may include some discrepancies. Note that Head Start child counts are based on cumulative enrollment (total children served) by race/ethnicity, as funded enrollment (i.e. slots) for race/ethnicity does not exist. Note that Head Start and Early Head Start collect data on more racial categories than listed above, so certain categories were not included ("Other Race:" 1,271 clients; and "Unspecified Race:" 750 clients); the full data set of race/ethnicity categories is below. Also please note that Lewis-Clark and Mid-Columbia Children's Council (MCCC) are located in Idaho and Oregon respectively but have slots in WA. These programs are not captured in WA state level PIR reports and therefore must be calculated separately and added in. Numbers for these programs are calculated based upon the percent of their slots in WA as applied to their total cumulative enrollment (these are estimates). Also please note that EHS data may include some pregnant women.



**RTT-ELC Supplementary Data Notes (Tables) for Annual Performance Report 2015:**

Cumulative Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity 2015									
Head Start and Early Head Start in WA State	Hispanic Ethnicity	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Bi/Multi-Racial	White	Other Race	Unspecified Race
HS	4,599	383	495	1,345	194	1,325	5,731	996	918
EHS	1,571	87	142	349	47	374	2,159	267	286
AIAN HS	120	970	1	3	9	72	112	26	9
AIAN EHS	18	380	0	1	23	35	23	1	1
MSSH	1,926	1	0	0	2	2	371	65	211
Lewis-Clark HS	2	6	0	1	0	12	117	0	0
Lewis-Clark EHS	4	3	0	0	0	6	38	0	0
MCCC HS	179	11	0	7	9	33	374	2	0
MCCC EHS	23	0	0	0	0	1	28	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,442</b>	<b>1,841</b>	<b>638</b>	<b>1,706</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>1,860</b>	<b>8,953</b>	<b>1,357</b>	<b>1,425</b>

Numbers for Lewis/Clark and MCCC are done by taking percentages of the total: MCCC HS (34%); MCCC EHS (45%); LC HS (6%); LC EHS (83%).

Migrant and Seasonal Numbers were calculated via percentages of the total enrollment. The PIR reporting system changed in 2015, which may explain some of the deviations from values reported in previous APRs.

**IDEA Part C:**

Data from the IDEA Part C Annual Reports (Dec 1 of the program year).

IDEA Part C Age Segments	2015 Program Year						
	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 Children	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>Totals</b>	<b>1,620</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>4,141</b>
Children < 1 yr	258	35	88	54	10	92	777
Children age >= 1 yr and < 2 yr	595	38	157	123	32	172	1,515
Children 2 – 3 yrs	767	55	227	130	30	203	1,849

**RTT-ELC Supplementary Data Notes (Tables) for Annual Performance Report 2015:**

Combined DSHS – Children’s Administration Child Care Programs:

Programs under combined DSHS-CA Child Care include child care provided to foster children, child protective services (CPS) children, and Medicaid treatment (MTCC) children. The age of children was calculated as of January 1st of the fiscal year (January 1st 2011 for SFY2011, January 1st 2012 for SFY2012, etc.). Data from DSHS, Research and Data Analysis, Client Services Database (PEGASUS) analytical extract of 2/9/2016, representing the unduplicated number of children under five years olds served in one or more of those programs for at least one month during the fiscal year. Totals by year are shown below:

Fiscal Year	Number of Hispanic children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian , Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children	Number of Children Not Otherwise Racially Identified	Total Number of Children
2011	978	202	26	228	1,299	1,777	21	4,531
2012	975	226	23	195	1,252	1,828	14	4,513
2013	959	241	25	205	1,300	2,051	22	4,803
2014	905	242	31	252	1,214	2,298	37	4,979
2015	857	254	25	258	941	2,149	30	4,514

Home Visiting:

Home Visiting represents total activity for the programs shown below:

Home Visiting Programs	State FY 2015						
	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 Children	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
Parent Child Assistance Program	205	35	0	41	2	301	452
Parent Child Home Program (PCHP)	401	3	163	397	22	77	82
Parents as Teachers (PAT)	892	233	10	78	9	126	560
STEEP; Parenting Partnership	14	0	2	6	2	7	14
Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP)	191	22	2	36	5	52	254
Partnering with Families for Early Learning (PFEL)	47	0	0	0	0	0	0

**RTT-ELC Supplementary Data Notes (Tables) for Annual Performance Report 2015:**

Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP)	1	1	0	3	0	3	1
Family Spirit	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,751</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>1,363</b>

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

IDEA Parts C and B:

Data from the IDEA Part C Annual Reports (Dec 1 of the program year) and IDEA Part B Annual Report (Nov 1 of the program year). \* Correction to IDEA Part B, program year 2011 as reported in the RTT-ELC application (9,946).

IDEA Part C Age Segments	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Children < 1 yr	503	549	653	993	1,126	1,314
Children age >= 1 yr and < 2 yr	1,691	1,687	1,751	2,120	2,284	2,632
Children 2 – 3 yrs	3,398	3,331	3,410	2,967	3,119	3,261
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5,592</b>	<b>5,567</b>	<b>5,814</b>	<b>6,080</b>	<b>6,529</b>	<b>7,207</b>
<b>IDEA Part B</b>						
Children ages 3-kindergarten entry	9,681	9,682*	9,808	9,515	9,701	10,105
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>15,273</b>	<b>15,249</b>	<b>15,622</b>	<b>15,595</b>	<b>16,230</b>	<b>17,222</b>

Home Visiting:

Home Visiting represents total activity for the programs shown below:

Home Visiting Programs	State FY 2011				State FY 2012				State FY 2013				State FY 2014			
	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Pre-K Ages 3 to K entry	Total	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Pre-K Ages 3 to K entry	Total	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Pre-K Ages 3 to K entry	Total	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Pre-K Ages 3 to K entry	Total
Parent Child Assistance Program	256	441	241	938	260	512	145	917	294	583	129	1,006	317	648	166	1,131
Parent Child Home Program (PCHP)	-	476	125	601	-	435	103	538	-	636	265	901	0	454	638	1,092
Parents as Teachers (PAT)	498	915	522	2,287	445	1,017	218	1,680	633	998	297	1,928	654	889	275	1,818
STEEP; Parenting Partnership	9	13	33	82	13	62		75	41	49	0	90	25	35	19	71
Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP)	409	599	-	1,028	429	599		1,028	1,096	763		1,859	1,228	928	0	2,156
Partnering with Families for Early Learning (PFEL)	61	145	-	157	35	67	-	102	9	11	8	28	27	35	0	44
Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP)													4	8	0	12
Family Spirit																
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,233</b>	<b>2,589</b>	<b>921</b>	<b>5,093</b>	<b>1,182</b>	<b>2,692</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>4,340</b>	<b>2,073</b>	<b>3,040</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>5,812</b>	<b>2,255</b>	<b>2,997</b>	<b>1,098</b>	<b>6,324</b>

**RTT-ELC Supplementary Data Notes (Tables) for Annual Performance Report 2015:**

Home Visiting Programs	SFY 2015			
	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Pre-K Ages 3 to K entry	Total
Parent Child Assistance Program	594	369	263	1,226
Parent Child Home Program (PCHP)	0	144	1,012	1,156
Parents as Teachers (PAT)	554	1,006	406	1,996
STEEP; Parenting Partnership	7	13	25	45
Nurse-Family Partnership (NFP)	216	247	N/A	463
Partnering with Families for Early Learning (PFEL)	27	13	2	42
Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP)	1	3	5	9
Family Spirit	1	2	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,400</b>	<b>1,797</b>	<b>1,713</b>	<b>4,940</b>

**First Steps:**

Data for 2010 is shown below, but was not included in the RTT-ELC application. Data from 2007 through 2009 from First Steps Database/Medicaid claims. Data reported for state fiscal years (July 1 – June 30). The number of infants on Medicaid who received at least one home visit through Infant Case Management or whose mothers received at least one postpartum home visit through Maternity Support Services during the specified time period. All infants were live born and had family incomes of up to and including 185 percent of the FPL. One infant may receive services and be counted in more than one year. Children are eligible for Infant Case Management only during the first year of life.

Data for 2010 through 2012: In 2010 Washington Medicaid’s claims processing system changed. Prior to 2010, different procedure codes identified MSS home visits as opposed to office visits. In 2010 and later, the procedure codes changed and home visits can be identified only by a “place of service” variable. Represents the number of infant/mother dyads who received at least one home visit provided by postpartum Maternity Support Services or Infant Case Management during the stated year. There is a less than 1 percent missing data for place of service in both 2011 and 2012, although the data may change as claims are paid.

Note that management of the First Steps program changed (subsequent to the RTT-ELC application) from DSHS to the Washington State Health Care Authority; however, DSHS provided data as presented in the 2012 APR. 2013 Data Notes: Data source unchanged. 2014 Data Notes: Data source unchanged.

Data for 2015: reported participation based on calendar year ending 12/31/2015, whereas 2014 APR reported data is based on state fiscal year (July 1 – June 30). If based on the calendar year, then the reported value for 2014 would be 10,047.

First Steps	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Infants Under Age 1</b>	22,838	22,913	21,617	15,916	15,117	11,837	11,947	10,303	7,290