

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**

Wisconsin

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 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#: S412A130037

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

3. Grantee Address State Capitol, 115 East
City: Madison
State: Wisconsin Zip: 53702

4. Project Director Name: Eloise Anderson
Title: Wisconsin Department of Children and Families
Phone #: (608) 422-7067 Ext.: _____ Fax #: (608) 266-6836
Email: Eloise.Anderson@wisconsin.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: 07/01/2013 To: Until Amended

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.

During 2015 Wisconsin made significant progress implementing the programs and activities funded by the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grant and overcoming challenges.

In 2015 RTT-ELC continued to help improve the quality of the early care and education provided to young children and their families in Wisconsin by enhancing YoungStar, Wisconsin's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), helping more children gain access to high-quality care, and helping child care providers improve the quality of the care they provide.

Enhancements to the QRIS system in 2015 included improving the reliability, validity, and speed of YoungStar ratings by utilizing software created by Branagh Information Group and creating a revised progression of family engagement standards that will be included in the YoungStar Rating Criteria starting in 2016 and be required starting in 2017. The first results from the YoungStar validation study were finalized and provided evidence that YoungStar ratings do in fact represent differing degrees of quality.

In order to help more children gain access to high-quality care in 2015 RTT-ELC funded a paid media campaign to inform parents on the importance of quality early care, what YoungStar is, and how it can help inform their care choices. In addition to the paid media campaign, the YoungStar website was revised to be more streamlined and user-friendly, and grassroots outreach efforts provided information at community locations. Outreach efforts continued in 2015 to increase participation of other early childhood care providers, such as 4-Year-Old Kindergarten (4K), 4K Community Approaches (4KCA), and Head Start in YoungStar.

In 2015 child care providers were provided with many opportunities to increase the quality of the care they provide. This included the creation of resources for providers serving children with disabilities and their families, additional T.E.A.C.H. scholarships, on-site technical assistance in addition to the standard YoungStar hours, Educational Opportunities Grants, and grants to support Accreditation. In addition to programs designed to help providers increase the quality of the care they provide, RTT-ELC also funded Challenge Awards in 2015 which were monetary awards given to providers who had increased their YoungStar rating in the previous year.

In addition to directly improving the quality of early care and education, in 2015 RTT-ELC continued to build and strengthen the overall system of early childhood in Wisconsin. Wisconsin's early childhood system has many moving pieces and components, and RTT-ELC has provided many opportunities for professionals to come together and align. Collaboration across state agencies and sectors of early childhood is often not easy work and RTT-ELC provided many platforms for this work to move forward and make progress throughout 2015. This includes the work of the Tribal-State Relations workgroup, the Online Professional Development System Portfolio, the Professional Development Initiative, and the steering committees for both the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards and the Wisconsin Pyramid Model. 2015 also saw significant progress in the development of a network of local early childhood coalitions from around the state.

Many of the challenges associated with the creation of an integrated early childhood database in previous years were overcome in 2015. Both the Department of Children and Families and the Department of Health Services created databases within their agencies that brought together data that has never before been integrated. In addition to the agency specific databases, the cross-agency early childhood integrated data system (ECIDS) also made great strides in selecting a technical solution, creating governance structures, and establishing a research agenda.

Successful State Systems

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

Governance Structure

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

The governance structure established during the first year of the grant continued to be successful in 2015. At the highest level, Wisconsin's grant is overseen by the Secretary of the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the top executive at the lead agency. The Grant Manager oversees the day-to-day grant activities and reports to the leadership committee. The leadership committee consists of the Division Administrator from the Division of Early Care and Education, the Assistant State Superintendent from the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), and the State Health Officer and Administrator from the Division of Public Health at the Department of Health Services. The complexity of the ECIDS requires that a Portfolio Manager, housed at DPI, oversee the projects and activities at each agency that are related to data systems.

The Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) continues to play an important role in Wisconsin's RTT-ELC grant activities. The ECAC was instrumental in developing many of the foundational concepts with the state's RTT-ELC grant application, and the RTT-ELC activities continue to align with and support ECAC stated outcomes.

Public Private Partnership

The creation of a Network of public private partnerships made significant progress in 2015. In July a Request for Proposal was issued so that local early childhood coalitions could apply for grants. The intent of the grants was to provide support for local coalitions to increase their capacity to create meaningful public private partnerships in their communities. The funds were not intended for coalitions to directly fund early childhood programs, but instead to increase their ability to reach out in their communities and foster new relationships that could result in new funding opportunities. For example, communities could organize a business breakfast to inform local business on the importance of early childhood and how they could invest. Six grants were awarded from 13 proposals in late 2015 and the first progress reports are expected in early 2016.

In addition to the grants awarded to local coalitions work also moved forward on the creation of the state Hub to support the network of local coalitions. A local communication firm was contracted with in order to create a brand, logo, website, and other marketing materials. A series of quarterly professional development opportunities for the network coalitions was also planned for 2016.

Tribal Relations

A core component of our system-building and overall governance efforts has been our project to enhance relations among and within tribal and state agencies and associations. In 2014, the Project Coordinator was hired through an interagency agreement with the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. (GLITC) and provided the central point for coordination among the eleven tribal nations, state staff across multiple departments, and other cross-sector professionals. This position has been vital to the work of this project. Throughout 2015, the coordinator has been a key contact in department and cross department state collaborations as well as internal and external collaborations among the Tribal Communities which are described below.

In 2015, the project was enhanced by a major partnership within the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) between the RTT project and the DPI Special Education Team's Disproportionality Network. The "Network" is funded by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act with a focus on equitable

referrals, services, and education for children who are racially and ethnically diverse. The “Network” has an early childhood tribal nations component. The two projects collaborated to develop visioning, implementation strategies, and resource sharing through a jointly developed work plan.

Cross department collaboration continues through quarterly meetings of the Tribal-State Connections Workgroup. This work group includes two members from GLITC, seventeen members from the three state departments and funded projects, tribal liaisons from each of the three departments, the Head Start Collaboration Office, three other tribal representatives including an Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) member, and representatives from three other related associations. A smaller leadership group began to meet that included the tribal liaisons from each of the three state departments to assure more coordination of efforts directly among the state departments and a higher level of tribal input at the state level. In 2015, this smaller cross department leadership group has also invited the Tribal Liaison from the Department of Administration where they found similarity in the concepts of disproportionality and historical trauma. The DCF Tribal Liaison retired, and meetings will continue when this position is filled in early 2016. Both of these groups played important roles in shaping and participating in the project activities that are described below.

A major focus of this project has been the systematic approach to gather information and make connections to each of the tribal nations. The 2013 Tribal Gathering and Listening Session laid the groundwork for the state to “listen and learn” from the 11 tribal communities about perceptions about their early childhood programs, individual challenges, and stated hopes for improving outcomes for tribal children and their families. It also brought to the table discussions about relationships and communication among tribes, between tribes, and with the state agencies. The next step after the 2013 Tribal Gathering was a May 2015 meeting with 8 of the 11 tribal communities represented to continue strategic planning and vision building for the project. At this meeting, Tribal participants work in community teams to identify early childhood teams to paint a picture of how early childhood looks like now and what it could look like in the future. There was a presentation from the Menominee Tribal Community showcasing their efforts to improve the lives of children and families through a 90 day planning process. The prospect of RTT mini-grants was presented and input from the participants generated other potential topics for the mini-grants, such as literacy of family engagement. The presented priority areas were based on existing RTT professional development areas. Based on tribal input, there were changes made to the next step plans that included delaying implementation of WI Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) training to assure cultural relevance and including the ASQ training as a high priority. New topical areas were also added to the mini-grant options including: Internal Tribal network and collaboration, fatherhood initiatives, transitions from Birth to 3 Early Intervention programs into special education, transition from Head Start to kindergarten, historical trauma/ trauma informed care training, other disproportionality of services, or early literacy.

The next step focused on a Tribal Gathering held on October 19, 2015, with 8 of the 11 Tribal Nations and members of the Tribal State Relations and State Liaisons attending. This gathering reinforced the concept of networking within and among the tribal early childhood programs by support teams participating and having teams work on cross sector future plans. The event adopted a 90 day work plan process from the Menominee community. The gathering was a facilitated session where each nation identified where they were now for young children, where they wanted to be in the future, and what can they do in the first 90 days to move to the future. Utilizing the resources from RTT and the Network, the sequence of 90 day planning has taken hold. In December 2015, the 90 day planning teams came back together for additional support in their plans and to share their activities. These plans set the stage for the final release of the RTT mini-grants with applications due in January 2016.

This project had a major priority to increase tribal access to the professional development project connected to RTT. Our first effort focused on the RTT developed early literacy module. On June 4, the early literacy training module was presented to the Inter-Tribal Child Care Council with resources for providing the training with each Tribal Nation. This effort taught us that there needed to be much more culturally sensitive work done before we could obtain buy in and increase the use of resource material. It also reinforced our knowledge of the tribal interest in native language development that included the need for reading materials in the various native languages. We anticipate some of the RTT mini-grants

will address this topic.

Our second professional development focus was to increase tribal utilization of the WMELS. Through our project, we have learned more about the perspectives of the Tribes to WMELS. We learned that we needed to adapt the WMELS trainer approval process and make the materials more culturally relevant. In July 2015, the WMELS Leadership Committee approved a proposal to adapt the trainer process and training materials. The WMELS Tribal Training cohort began training on September 10. There were 10 potential trainers registered from 6 tribal communities, but we ended up with 8 from 5 communities. In October, the WMELS Tribal Pilot train-the-trainers had their first face to face Community of Practice and training meeting. Follow-up activities are one of the strategies that can be funded through the mini-grants. In November and December 2015, coaching and mentoring activities occurred with the trainers going through the approval process.

Through our “listening” and strategic planning, we also learned of the high level of interest in the tribal communities in screening and assessment. This aligned with our RTT project so we increased the work in this area. In August 2015, the project hosted training with the Brookes Publishing Company to develop staff that could use the Ages and Stages screening tool. There was representation from 10 of the 11 tribal nations. Follow-up activities are one of the strategies that can be funded through the mini-grants.

The development of a “scan” to identify the service and professional development linkages and gaps between state and tribal programs for young children and families has been a scope of work throughout this project. The cataloging of the various programs at the state and within the 11 tribal nations has been more difficult than anticipated so is still only partially completed. The process was complicated by the multitude of different programs with each of the 11 tribes, the lack of key contact points within tribe, the mobility among employees who would become key contacts, and the creation of a data system that would allow information to be updatable and accessible. Work continues on this process. Completion of the contact information was built into the Gathering/Listening session process. The format of the scan is being changed to Excel to allow easier updating. We are exploring how to connect this to the Professional Development System Portfolio that is also being developed. To reinforce the importance of this project, the Tribal State Connections Workgroup adopted this as one of the areas to work in through the 90 day plan process.

Each year we have summarized lesson learned strategies. Below are the 2014 strategies and those identified or utilized in 2015.

- 2015: More concerted effort by state agencies to consider how to best coordinate cross sectors.
- 2015: Direct funding of tribal efforts that align with state level projects.
- 2015: Modification of WMELS materials to better reflect cultural practices.
- 2015: Sponsor and host events specific for Tribal participation including ASQ training and WMELS train the trainer.
- 2014: Directly involve tribal leaders in planning and implementation of initiatives.
- 2014: Need for multiple methods for networking with state level partners, including increase collaboration with DPI, DCF, and DHS tribal liaisons.
- 2014: Need for multiple methods for networking among the Tribal Nations, and within each Tribal community; including increasing role of GLITC in early childhood collaboration.
- 2014: Cultural responsive practices needs direct input from the various Tribal Nations beyond the obvious addition of different videos representing the tribal community to existing training modules.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

Stakeholder involvement continues to be a central component of Wisconsin's RTT-ELC activities and programs in 2015.

Many of the RTT-ELC activities and projects required stakeholder participation in 2015. For example, the DCF Inclusion Analyst began planning an Inclusion Institute for the fall of 2016 that will bring together professionals from all areas of early childhood to develop a common language and understanding of what inclusion means in early childhood. The planning committee for this event includes members from all state agencies, a number of community organizations, and child care providers.

Also many RTT-ELC staff have stayed engaged in stakeholder activities outside of RTT-ELC in 2015. For example, the DCF Family Engagement Analyst participated in many stakeholder groups including the ECAC Family and Community Partnership Team, Wisconsin Breastfeeding Friendly Coalition, and Prevent Blindness Wisconsin, the DCF Professional Development Analyst plays an active role in the higher education articulation work group, a Business and Professional Practices work group, and attending meetings with the Tribal communities, and the DCF Inclusion Analyst has been attending meetings with Birth to 3 staff, working on an Expulsion survey for child care providers, and attending the Bi-lingual Community of Practice.

In addition to the day-to-day work of the grant, in 2015 the RTT-ELC team began the process of sustainability planning for when the grant period has ended. A series of meetings were planned in late 2015 and early 2016 so that the stakeholders who contributed to planning the initial grant activities could hear an update on all the work that has been done and also provide their input into ideas and suggestions for ways to sustain all the important work that has been done. The ideas and suggestions of the stakeholders from all areas of early childhood will play an important role in the recommendations to leadership on sustaining the work of RTT-ELC.

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.

The reauthorization of the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) in 2014 continues to both impact and inform Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge activities in Wisconsin. Many of the requirements outlined in the new CCDBG are closely related to the RTT-ELC activities and programs. One area that Wisconsin focused on heavily in 2015 was around serving children with disabilities and their families in child care settings. Although the new CCDBG requirements do not specifically require anything from states they do provide solid guidance on steps that states can take to create a better for children with disabilities and their families. Wisconsin has taken a number of steps including better data collection on families receiving child care subsidy benefits, planning an Inclusion Institute for providers state-wide, and drafting a written agreement between three state agencies.

Participating State Agencies

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

There has been no change to the commitment of the participating state agencies; all state agencies remain fully committed.

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.

On-Site Technical Consultation for YoungStar Providers

In 2015 on-site technical consultation continued to be a major component of the YoungStar system. With the research demonstrating the importance of consultation and coaching as necessary for real change to practice, in 2014 the YoungStar Consortium developed a process to give the trained Technical Consultants a set of protocols for on-site technical consultation related to specific content areas. Once a child care provider has taken a training associated with a particular content area, s/he becomes eligible to apply for additional hours of on-site technical consultation. These on-site hours are in addition to the providers' regular YoungStar consultation hours and focus on the protocols given to the YoungStar TCs. These additional on-site hours allow providers the opportunity to apply the content learned in the training to their specific programs, and providers can ask questions and receive support around their specific needs.

In 2014 the protocols and applications were developed for Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, the Ages & Stages Questionnaire, and the Wisconsin Pyramid Model. 1,059 hours of additional on-site technical consultation were completed with 127 total providers.

In 2015, the RTTT-ELC content areas were expanded to include family engagement while still offering additional consultation on the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, the Ages & Stages Questionnaire, and the Wisconsin Pyramid Model.

In 2015, RTTT-ELC supported 254 child care programs with 1,522 hours of additional on-site technical consultation. Of the 1,522 hours, 220.5 were for ASQ, 323 for Family Engagement, 278 for Pyramid Model and 700 for Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards. The RTTT-ELC support for additional technical consultation hours by Star level is 317 hours for 2 Star rated, 924 hours for 3 Star rated, 163 for 4 Star rated, and 55 hours for 5 Star rated programs. 52 hours were provided to programs where a Star level was not provided or were not yet rated.

Of the 254 child care programs, 48 were rated at 2 Star, 102 were rated at 3 Star, 12 were rated at 4 Star, and 16 were rated at 5 Star. No data was provided for 31 programs and five programs were not yet rated. The programs supported with additional technical consultation were located in all six of the YoungStar regions with the breakdown being: 5 from Southeastern, 74 from Milwaukee, 42 from Northeastern, 50 from Northern, 30 from Southern and 63 from the Western Region. The hours were divided utilized by three different provider types: 71 Family care providers, 182 Group Care providers, and 11 School Age programs.

Family Engagement

In 2015 the revisions to the Family Engagement indicator for YoungStar were completed.

The enhanced indicator is in YoungStar's 2016 evaluation criteria as two optional points. Programs can earn one or two points by showing evidence of five (one point) or ten (two points) practices in family engagement. Programs have a total of 42 options in five categories. The five categories include:

- Transitioning
- Family Engagement

- Family Communication Strategies
- Family Support Strategies
- Family Community Connection Strategies

In 2017 programs that are rated 3 Star will be required to earn one point and will have the option of earning the second point available. Programs that are rated 4 and 5 Star will be required to earn two points.

Serving Children with Disabilities/Special Needs and their Families

Much work was accomplished around serving children with disabilities or special needs and their families.

This includes the continuation of great cross-section collaboration. An Inclusion Workgroup, including: DPI, DHS, DCF, University of Wisconsin Waisman Center, Wisconsin Early Childhood Association, United Cerebral Palsy, as well as others, meets monthly to work together on multiple inclusion projects, currently focusing on the Early Childhood Inclusion Institute. Additionally, we are preparing to begin the process of creating a WI Statement on Inclusion, in response to the Federal Joint Statement on Inclusion, recently released in September 2015.

A new Special Needs Rate Verification Form was developed. In Wisconsin through the W-2 Shares program, child care providers are reimbursed with subsidy funds based on a family's eligibility. There are additional subsidy funds available for the care of children with disabilities. Most counties in WI have decided that this additional funding can be used for a higher reimbursement rate to child care programs that serve children with disabilities.

Previously, the documentation regarding the request for a higher reimbursement rate was vague; most requests were only documented briefly and did not describe why the child care provider needed a higher subsidy rate adequately.

The newly created form documents communication from three entities regarding the disability of a child: the family describes the disability and indicates a request for a higher subsidy reimbursement rate, the child care program indicates how the higher reimbursement rate will help provide supports for the child and the child's doctor or service provider confirms the child's disability. This facilitates communication between parents, caregivers and service providers which creates a foundation of support for the successful inclusion of the child in the program. Additionally, this allows data to be saved which can be confidentially aggregated if the Department of Children and Families determines the best system to do so in the future.

The form and Operations Memo were sent to all necessary entities on October 12, 2015.

A series of Early Childhood Inclusion web-pages were created. The Early Childhood Inclusion Web-pages are linked to the Department of Children and Families YoungStar website. The pages are for families or child care providers to find resources regarding creating an inclusive environment and caring for children with special needs. Included on the webpages are multiple local and state resources for inclusion, links to national resources, tip sheets for child care providers, the Inclusive Practices for Young Children modules (to be posted 2016), links to additional on-line and in-person trainings and information regarding federal laws.

These web-pages are active and are being reviewed and updated as needed.

A seven module on-line course called "Inclusive Practices for Young Children" is currently being developed in collaboration with staff from the Department of Public Instruction (DPI). Modules 1-5 are in final edits and Module 6 and 7 are in process. Anticipated release and posting of training is Early 2016. All modules are designed for individuals to complete themselves or for groups to download. The modules include: Foundations and Definition of Inclusion, Attitudes, Beliefs and your Philosophy of Inclusion, Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP), Screening and Assessment, and Characteristics of Disabilities and Special Needs. Modules 6 and 7 don't have specific content yet.

Additionally, the necessary equipment and software is being purchased by the appropriate DCF Bureau of Information and Technology and should be available to use in January 2016 in order to create on-line video trainings through the Milwaukee of Early Care Administration's (MECA) Special Needs Supports Program. The goal of these webinar like trainings is to allow child care providers throughout WI to have access to the high quality trainings offered in Milwaukee, WI.

The beginnings of a written agreement between the Department of Health Services (DHS), DPI, and DCF was started. The goal for a written agreement is to create consistent messaging to promote and strengthen early intervention/special education services in natural/least restrictive environments and to increase partnerships with community child care programs.

An Early Childhood Inclusion Institute has been planned for September 27-28, 2016 at Chula Vista Resort in Wisconsin Dells, WI. Approximately 200 professionals from the early childhood field, including YoungStar Technical Consultants and statewide disability resource agency staff are expected to attend. The goals of this institute are to: develop a common language and understanding of inclusion throughout the regional network of service and technical assistance providers, and support a cohesive system of inclusion services by using communication and partnership throughout WI. The contract with the facilities is nearly complete and a time line for the Call for Proposals process, Save the Date and Registration has been implemented. Camille Catlett PhD from the Frank Porter Graham Institute at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill has agreed to be the keynote speaker for the event.

Finally, DCF has contracted with Supporting Families Together Association (SFTA) to provide three series of the Parent Cafés specifically for parents with children who have special needs in La Crosse, Dane (for parents speaking Spanish) and Marathon counties.

Health and Wellness

In 2014 DHS successfully expanded its capacity by recruiting a Health and Wellness Analyst. The position was created in part as a liaison to the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families (DCF), to coordinate with the Maternal and Child Health (MCH) program at the Department of Health Services (DHS) and to outreach to other relevant organizations. YoungStar has a Health and Wellness category which contains required points. Many of these points are connected to programs and services offered by DHS. Creating a stronger connection between the programs will help child care providers improve the quality of their care and meet these health and wellness points. As a result, a significant job duty during 2015 was to gain familiarity with the state landscape of health and wellness initiatives.

The DHS Health and Wellness Analyst joined a number of health related early childhood initiatives during 2015. These include:

The Wisconsin Obesity Prevention Initiative (WECOPI). The goal of WECOPI is to understand and promote health levels of nutrition and physical activity among children in child care settings. WECOPI put forward two recommendations for review by DCF; (1) increase daily physical activity requirements and (2) add having a garden, implementing Healthy Bites or becoming Breastfeeding Friendly Certified

to the options for the YoungStar nutrition point.

Active Early and Healthy Bites. Active Early and Healthy Bites are two recommended early childhood targeted resources to help improve the quality of physical activity and nutrition at ECE programs. In 2015 work started to explore how to best develop on-line modules for both Active Early and Healthy Bites. Work will continue on this in 2016.

Wisconsin in a Pediatric Obesity mini CoIIN. The mini CoIIN is organized and funded by the Association of Public Health Nurses (ASPHN). The mini CoIIN project uses a text message service, Healthy Habits at Home, to send physical activity and nutrition educational bits and ideas directly to the cell phones of ECE providers and the families they serve. The Wisconsin team will be refunded in 2016 for the next round.

Farm to Preschool (F2P). During 2015 work was started to create a project plan to use RTT-ELC funds to provide child care providers with micro grants to purchase the materials necessary to create a teaching garden. Groundwork was laid during 2015 for a similar project to better connect community and tribal operated gardens on tribal lands to tribal child care providers.

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.

4K

Wisconsin's state funded preschool program, four-year-old kindergarten (4K), continues to expand. For the 2015-2016 school year, eight new school districts began implementing 4K, thus bringing the state to 97% district implementation. These districts provide 4K to 48,109 students according to the 3rd Friday in September count. There are 115 school districts reporting that they are using four-year-old kindergarten community approaches models (4KCA). Districts implementing these 4KCA models contract with child care, Head Start, and/or private schools for on-site implementation of 4K.

Since many of these 4KCA districts provide 4K in child care settings, we continue to promote alignment of policies and practices especially related to YoungStar. In 2015, we expanded our website focus on 4KCA with additional video stories about their 4KCA model that highlight their partnership with child care and address quality improvement (see <http://dpi.wi.gov/early-childhood/kind/4k/4kca>). DPI staff also worked with the Wisconsin Association of School Boards on an article about 4K that included several districts that use community approach models (see http://issuu.com/wischoolnews/docs/wsn_sept_2015/6).

These community models demonstrate the benefits of programs working together and the impact of quality improvement practices. Each year the number of participating districts and participating community partners change. Data collection related to 4K and 4KCA models has been problematic in the past. Working through the ECIDS project internal and cross department data collection efforts are being identified as something that will improve data collection and allow better research. Within DP, the RTT Research Analyst is working with the internal data teams to improve our data collection on 4KCA. With DCF, our goal is to then be better able to align data with the data collected through their child care data systems.

Communication and networking continues among the DPI, DCF, CESAs, school districts, and YoungStar technical consultants and trainers. The Annual State Superintendent's 4 Year-Old Kindergarten Advisory Council on 4K and Community Approaches, held on April 1, 2015, and engaged

multiple stakeholders in this alignment work. Two annual events bring school district 4K coordinators and community partners from across the state to network and discuss issues with the state team. The first event was a statewide forum held on March 18-19, 2015. Over 200 people attended the Preserving Early Childhood: Collaborative Leadership Forum to engage in topics ranging from early childhood leadership, WI Model Early Learning Standards, community councils, cultural diversity, and 4K start-up. YoungStar and 4K coordination will be woven into various activities throughout the grant period. The second event, held on October 10, 2015, was a regional meeting with statewide videoconferencing. As one of the topics, we continued to explore district perspectives and involvement with YoungStar. The intended result is a system-building effort that is deeply informed by the concerns and perspectives of providers, foundations, and other stakeholders from all corners of Wisconsin.

Head Start and YoungStar

Wisconsin's TQRIS standards do not directly apply to Head Start programs, however Head Start programs are still encouraged to participate in YoungStar. Originally, all programs associated with Head Start were given an automatic 5 Star YoungStar rating. This YoungStar policy allowed any program that had a Head Start affiliation to be tracked as a Head Start program in the YoungStar automated case management system.

In 2013 the YoungStar policy was updated. Only Head Start programs that provide an average of three or fewer hours of child care per day are given an automatic 5 Star rating. Programs with less than 3 hours of child care are eligible for an automatic 5 Star rating. This change in policy reduced the apparent number of Head Start programs participating in TQRIS because the YoungStar automated Case Management System only tracks those with the automatic 5 Star rating. During 2015 plans were made to change the way data is entered about Head Start programs which will incorporate a feature into the automated Case Management System which will allow them to label any participating Head Start and Early Head Start site as such, regardless of Star rating.

In addition to improving the quality of the data regarding Head Start programs and YoungStar ratings collaboration between the two programs continued in 2015. A long history of working together exists between the two programs and they continue to work together around increasing the quality of care for children and their families.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.										
Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	5	1%	21	5%	42	10%	63	16%	100	25%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	37	27%	54	40%	88	65%	108	80%	136	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	3,858	100%	4,000	100%	4,200	100%	4,500	100%	5,000	100%
Other 1	4,897	77%	5,000	79%	5,100	80%	5,150	81%	5,200	82%
<i>Describe:</i>	All regulated programs									
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										

¹ 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	393	5	1%	389	17	4%	391	18	5%	403	23	6%			
<i>Specify:</i>															
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	136	37	27%	127	42	33%	311	45	15%	269	138	51%			
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	3,858	3,858	100%	3,510	3,481	99%	3,290	3,255	99%	3,076	3,076	100%			
Other 1	6,361	4,897	77%	5,912	4,593	78%	5,459	4,339	79%	5,158	4,077	79%			
<i>Describe:</i>	All regulated programs														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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

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

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

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

State-Funded Preschool

The state has 413 elementary school districts and 403 (97%) of these districts offer 4K (based on funding).

23 is the number of programs in TQRIS with a regulation type of "public school program" that had children enrolled that were not in school full-time.

Currently, we have no way of identifying which child care providers are participating in a 4K Community Approach (4KCA) program because neither DCF nor DPI collects that information. DPI has decided to prioritize the collection of information from school districts so that each school that participates in 4KCA will be asked to name the child care providers with whom they contract. Once the data is in the DPI system, a match will be run at least annually and that information will be transferred into the YoungStar automated Case Management System.

Early Head Start and Head Start

The number of Early Head Start and Head Start programs in the state is based on the EHS/HS program list from ACF.

The number of Early Head Start and Head Start programs participating in TQRIS was calculated by using the addresses in the ACF program list and matching them to addresses in the YoungStar automated Case Management System.

The way EHS/HS programs are tracked in the YoungStar automated Case Management System has been affected by changes in YoungStar policy over the last few years. Before RTTT Year 2 the YoungStar automated Case Management System allowed any program that had a Head Start affiliation to be tracked as a Head Start program; this included not just those programs that were Grantees or Delegates, but also subcontracted child care partner sites that delivered some Head Start services. Therefore, before Year 3, the number of Head Start programs was higher because these programs were given an automated 5 Star rating, regardless of how many hours of child care were being provided. Currently, YoungStar gives an automatic 5 Star rating only to those Head Start programs that provide an average of three or fewer hours of child care per day. Programs with less than 3 hours of child care receive oversight and monitoring by the Office of Head Start which is why they are eligible for an automatic 5 Star rating. This change in policy reduced the apparent number of Head Start programs participating in TQRIS because the YoungStar automated Case Management System only tracks those with the automated 5 Star rating.

In 2016 YoungStar is incorporating a feature into the automated Case Management System which will allow them to label any participating Head Start and Early Head Start site as such, regardless of Star rating. Although was system is not in place at the time of the report, the availability of the ACF program list made it possible for data to more accurately reflect all the HS/EHS programs participating in TQRIS then in Year 2.

Programs Receiving CCDF Funds

The number of programs that receive CCDF funds is calculated as a "point-in-time" figure. We can assumed the total number of programs that received funds at any point during the last year is higher.

Other 1: All Regulated Programs

These data do not include any estimates and are based on the number of active providers according to licensing and actual participation in TQRIS.

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.

State-Funded Preschool

It can be assumed that many more 4K and 4KCA programs are participating in TQRIS for the child care portion of the day than is represented in this data.

In order to increase the collaboration between 4K, 4KCA, and YoungStar two annual events are held where strategies and information are shared between providers. An information sheet was created to help explain the policies and alignment between the types of programs, and as data collection continues to improve more targeted outreach will be possible.

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.

Improving the reliability, validity, and speed of YoungStar Formal Raters

In order to increase the granularity and speed of YoungStar Environment Rating Scales (ERS) ratings, the Department of Children and Families (DCF) selected to purchase the ERS Data System developed by the Branagh Information Group. In 2014, the contract with Branagh was completed and work started on implementing the system in Wisconsin.

In October of 2014, all YoungStar Formal Raters attended a three-day training where they learned to implement the software on their tablets. Beginning in March 2015, all YoungStar Formal Raters began exclusively using the ERS software to document YoungStar classroom observations and intra-agency reliability testing.

The ERS software allows for quick and accurate scoring of classroom assessments. It also automatically produces report summaries, and notes areas where additional information needs to be provided by the assessor. This has reduced the amount of time an assessor spends completing high-quality, strength-based feedback by more than 25%. It has also eliminated mathematical and human errors in generating subscale and classroom scores. Led by DCF's Bureau of Information Technology, Wisconsin has been able to create a mechanism whereby ERS scores are directly transferred from the ERS software database into the YoungStar case management system. This allows us to analyze the intersection between specific ERS scores (and subscale scores) and a variety of other factors including classroom staff member education, overall points awarded, star rating awarded, and regulation type. By utilizing Branagh ERS software, all reliability scoring is maintained within the Branagh database. This allows us to ensure that ERS assessors are reliably using the scales when conducting classroom assessments. It also allows us to examine patterns within and among ERS assessors to ensure that no assessor is falsely inflating or deflating scores in certain areas of the scale.

Media Campaign, Communication Plan, and Parent Outreach

In order to ensure that all parents with young children have access to information on the importance of quality early care and education as well as information on YoungStar quality ratings and licensing the YoungStar/RTT-ELC team selected, through RFP process, Knupp & Watson & Wallmann (KW2), a well-known local marketing firm to implement a communication and media campaign that targeted

parents and families in 2014.

Between March and May of 2015 a paid advertising campaign was implemented. The advertising was targeted to parents of young children on the importance of selecting high quality early care and information on YoungStar. The paid advertising venues included Google AdWords, YouTube Pre-Roll Ads, Pandora Radio, Twitter Ads, selected regional print ads, terrestrial radio ads. As a result of the paid media campaign 6,000 new users visited the website during the media campaign and since the campaign, website traffic has nearly double. 82% of users who came from ads about YoungStar were new to the website and over 40 hours of YoungStar advertisements were viewed on YouTube.

In addition KW2 did a thorough review of the usability and user data on the YoungStar website using Google Analytics to determine where users were viewing content and to make recommendations for arrangement and removal of some content. The result was a streamlined and more user-friendly version of the website and the child care finder search application.

Finally, during 2015 two teams of five members serving the Milwaukee and Janesville/Beloit areas were hired to spread the messages of the campaign through community events, tabling, front porch chats, round tables and distribution of collateral materials (brochures and palm cards). This approach was able to reach individuals in settings that were comfortable to the receiver and in dialogue that was familiar, rather than preachy.

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.

Registry Coupons

In order to increase from a 2 Star rating to a 3 Star rating, a child care provider needs a Career Level assigned by The Registry. The initial cost of The Registry application to obtain a Career Level is \$50, which is a barrier for many providers. In 2014, RTT-ELC funds were used to provide "coupons" that covered the cost of The Registry application for YoungStar-participating child care providers.

Registry Coupons initially became available in April of 2014. Coupons were available until October 2016 or until the funds (\$45,000) were depleted. The funds were depleted in January 2015. A total of 1,048 coupons were issued and 401 distinct programs utilized coupons. Milwaukee County had the highest number of coupons used at 41 percent. Of these, 587 were new applications (at \$50 each), 286 were expired renewals (at \$40 each), 140 were renewals (at \$25 each), 23 were early renewals (at \$15 each), and 12 were 'other'. The majority (81%) of coupons were used by providers at licensed group centers (781), followed by licensed family providers (77). In addition, 134 day camp counselors used coupons, which is significant because 2014 was the first year that Licensed Day Camps participated in YoungStar.

Challenge Awards

A Challenge Award is a monetary award given to YoungStar participating child care providers who increase their YoungStar rating. It was decided that a Challenge Award check would be sent directly to each provider as a separate payment and would not be included with other payments such as Wisconsin Shares Child Care Subsidy payments.

In 2014, RTT-ELC funds were used to give Challenge Awards to 416 child providers who increased their YoungStar rating during 2013. A total of \$326,400 was awarded to providers.

In 2015 a total of 281 Challenge Awards were issued. A total of \$219,200 was divided among the providers. Amounts ranged from \$300 to \$1,300. A total of 110 large group centers, 79 small group centers, 78 licensed family child care programs, and 14 certified family child care programs received Challenge Awards in 2015.

Accreditation Support

YoungStar recognizes accreditation by a number of early childhood accreditation organizations as one pathway to a rating. As of January 13, 2016, there are 385 YoungStar participating providers who earned 4 or 5 Stars through accreditation. 9.5 percent of all participating providers are accredited, which is an increase of 1.5 percent from the same period in 2014.

In 2015, RTT-ELC funds were used to provide accreditation scholarships for group and family child care providers participating in YoungStar through two national affiliate membership organizations. The scholarships covered partial costs associated with additional technical consultation, as well as, partial costs of the accreditation process.

The Wisconsin Early Childhood Association (WECA), a state NAEYC affiliate, was awarded funds to provide scholarships for group child care programs seeking NAEYC accreditation. Programs that successfully complete NAEYC accreditation will be eligible for a five Star rating in YoungStar. As of January 21, 2016 WECA has accepted 16 applications with 4 programs still completing follow up materials. Of the 16 completed applications, the programs' ratings range from 2 to 5 Star with one program yet to be rated. The programs that have completed materials for accreditation scholarships are located in five of the six YoungStar regions: Milwaukee, Southeastern, Southern, Northeastern, and Northern regions.

The Wisconsin Family Child Care Association, state NAFCC affiliate, was awarded funds to provide scholarships for family child care providers who wish to earn NAFCC accreditation. Programs that successfully complete the NAFCC accreditation process will be eligible to earn a 4 or 5 Star rating. The Star rating earned for NAFCC accredited sites is variable due to educational requirements of staff. A NAFCC accredited site will eligible to earn a 4 Star rating; if the educational qualifications of staff are equal to a 5 Star rating in YoungStar then the site will earn a 5 Star rating.

The Wisconsin Family Child Care Association has enrolled 17 providers in the scholarship project. In 2015, accreditation scholarship supported the first two providers in the scholarship process to successfully earn NAFCC accreditation and each site is expecting to earn a 4 Star rating. Through 2015, 4 providers have applied for full accreditation, with two of those successfully earning accreditation. 13 providers have received their self-study kits and are in the initial stages of the accreditation process. WFCCA will continue to work with the providers in the project to ensure they are paired with a peer mentor, providing site visits, and preparing recipients for observations and final application.

Educational Opportunities Grant

In 2015, RTT-ELC funds were used to provide access to free credit-based instruction for YoungStar-participating child care providers who earned 2 and 3 Star ratings. The Educational Opportunities Grant is based on a pilot project done at the Milwaukee Area Technical College in 2013. The grant is providing 2 and 3 Star-rated YoungStar child care providers with the opportunity to complete the Wisconsin Registry approved Preschool, Infant/Toddler, Family Child Care, and Afterschool and Youth Development Credentials, as well as, earn credit for prior learning. The courses are being offered in community settings, at non-traditional times of day and formats, in languages other than English (if applicable), and academic supports such as individual professional development counseling will be included.

After awarding the initial eight contracts, some additional funding remained. Because of stipulations around the RFP process, these funds could only be made available to the schools who originally submitted proposals. DCF looked at areas of the state that could be better served by this grant and asked nearby grant recipients to reach out to technical colleges in these areas to determine if partnership could be created. Most of the underserved areas are located in the western area of the state, and the majority is very rural. Contact amendment proposals to fund these partnerships were due and evaluated in February 2015. Three additional institutions of higher education have been subcontracted through one of the initial grant recipients

The Educational Opportunities Grant was expanded through a contract amendment with Western Technical College. Western Technical College has contracted with Chippewa Valley Technical College (CVTC), Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College (WITC) and Nicolet Area Technical College (NATC) to provide intentional outreach and accessibility to tribal child care providers. Starting in the fall of 2015 WITC offered the Infant and Toddler Credential courses at community locations on the Bad River

Reservation, in Hayward, and in New Richmond. CVTV will be offering the Preschool Credential courses at a community location in Eau Claire also starting in 2015. NATC will also be offering two courses (Guiding Children's Behavior and Health, Safety and Nutrition) of the Preschool Credential at locations in three tribal communities - the Forest County Potawatomi Community, the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Community, and the Sokaogon Chippewa Community.

Through 2015, 879 students have participated in this grant. Students from all YoungStar regions participated in courses, 53 percent of students were in the age grouping of 25-24 and 35-44. It is notable that the highest level of education for 49% of the students was a high school diploma or equivalent. As part of the Educational Opportunities Grant, in 2015, 485 hours of professional development support were provided for participating students.

T.E.A.C.H. Scholarships

In 2015, RTT-ELC funds continued to provide funding to T.E.A.C.H., so that scholarships could be given to child care providers working at 2 and 3 Star rated programs, and a waiting list could be eliminated. In Fiscal year 2015 (October 2014-September 2015), 589 scholarship contracts were awarded through RTTT funding to recipients at 2 or 3 Star rated providers. The Wisconsin Early Childhood Association records data according to their fiscal year as listed above.

TEACH is a geographically diverse program that helps providers all across the state. Scholarship recipients live in 66 of Wisconsin's 72 counties. Thirty eight of Wisconsin's institutes of higher education provided instruction to TEACH scholarship recipients in the 2015 fiscal year including all institutions in the Wisconsin technical College System and many University of Wisconsin System schools across the state.

Child care providers who are participating in the Educational Opportunities Grant receive individual professional development counseling and are allowed to receive free instruction under the grant and have a TEACH scholarship at the same time. We anticipate that this connection will encourage providers to remain in the field after the Education Opportunities Grant concludes and will directly connect interested providers to the next step of higher education after they complete The Registry Credentials.

On-Site Technical Consultation for YoungStar Providers

As previously described, in 2015 on-site technical consultation continued to be a major component of the YoungStar system. With the research demonstrating the importance of consultation and coaching as necessary for real change to practice, in 2014 the YoungStar Consortium developed a process to give the trained Technical Consultants a set of protocols for on-site technical consultation related to Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, the Ages & Stages Questionnaire, and the Wisconsin Pyramid Model. In 2015, the RTTT-ELC content areas were expanded to include family engagement while still offering additional consultation on the Wisconsin Model Early learning Standards, the Ages & States Questionnaires, and the Wisconsin Pyramid Model.

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.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	4,897	5,000	5,100	5,150	5,200
Number of programs in Tier 1	36	36	34	32	30
Number of programs in Tier 2	2,980	3,400	3,000	2,662	2,200
Number of programs in Tier 3	852	1,069	1,426	1,581	2,000
Number of programs in Tier 4	128	165	240	386	420
Number of programs in Tier 5	269	330	400	489	550
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	4,897	4,593	4,339	4,077	
Number of programs in Tier 1	36	27	14	12	
Number of programs in Tier 2	2,980	2,621	2,330	2,005	
Number of programs in Tier 3	852	1,228	1,264	1,304	
Number of programs in Tier 4	128	174	187	197	
Number of programs in Tier 5	269	342	370	387	
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated				172	

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

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

All data are actual data based on YoungStar participation and do not include any estimates.

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.

Although the target number of providers for each tier has not been met (the overall number of regulated providers in Wisconsin has been decreasing over the last decade, similar to the national trend), the proportion of higher-rated programs continues to increase at the rate or better than the rate suggested by the target numbers.

Meaningful changes in the percentages of participating programs in each tier can be seen. For example, in Year Two programs in Tier 4 and 5 made up 13.5% of participating programs and in Year Three programs in Tier 4 and 5 make up 15% of the participating programs. This is very close to the 16% suggested in the target numbers. This demonstrates that there is an increasing trend in the number of high quality programs even given the decreasing number of regulated providers.

We believe that continuing the current programs and initiatives will continue to have a positive impact on the number of programs in the higher tiers. Race to the Top has and is continuing to provide many opportunities to assist and support programs in increasing their rating.

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"?

Highest tiers are defined as tiers 4 and 5.

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.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.										
Targets: Number and 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	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool										
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	2,432	15%	5,775	35%	8,250	50%	12,375	75%	16,500	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	6,219	15%	6,913	17%	8,132	20%	9,759	24%	10,572	26%
Other 1	8,325	15%	9,435	17%	11,100	20%	13,332	24%	14,430	26%
<i>Describe:</i>	All regulated programs									
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										

¹ 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															
<i>Specify:</i>															
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	16,500	2,432	15%	15,433	2,983	19.3%	15,105	3,172	21%	7,530	5,223	69%			
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	40,662	6,219	15%	42,831	8,432	19.7%	42,028	9,022	21.5%	42,103	9,687	23%			
Other 1	55,000	8,325	15%	57,934	11,413	19.7%	56,848	11,825	21.5%	170,193	51,748	30%			
<i>Describe:</i>	All regulated programs														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

¹ 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.

Early Head Start/Head Start

The number of children in EHS/HS is based on the program list from The Office of Head Start using the formula of capacity data X 1.3 to determine enrollment.

The number of children in EHS/HS top tiers is based on the same calculations and matching programs from The Office of Head Start list to currently rated 4 and 5 Star programs.

In previous years this data was based on estimates. We are confident that this year's data more accurately reflects enrollment in Early Head Start/Head Start and does not actually represent a significant decrease in enrollment.

Programs Receiving CCDF Funds

This number is based on the actual number of children in the Wisconsin Shares Child Care Subsidy Program with an open authorization at the time the data report was created. This is a point-in-time value.

Other 1: All Regulated Programs

In prior years, these values were extrapolated based on an estimated increase in percentage. A count of children receiving Shares payments was used to estimate the percent enrolled in the top tiers of the TQRIS. This year, we calculated these values based on actual regulated capacity size for all programs participating in the TQRIS, and for all programs at the top tiers of the TQRIS. We believe these numbers more accurately reflect the current status of Wisconsin's early learning programming.

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.

The number and percentage of children with high needs attending programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS for all three programs met or nearly met the targets for Year Three.

We are confident that current programs and initiatives such as the Challenge Awards and the Educational Opportunities Grant will continue to support the movement of programs to higher tiers and therefore increase the number and percentage of children with high needs who attend programs in the top tiers. We also believe that programs such as the YoungStar Communication Campaign will help parents select and enroll their children in programs in the top tiers.

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

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

The Wisconsin Early Child Care Study (WECCS) was undertaken to provide an examination of the validity of YoungStar's rating scale. The study was conducted by Dr. Katherine Magnuson from the University of Wisconsin's Institute on Research and Poverty. The study was designed both to examine whether the rating scale is able to differentiate programs according to their levels of independently observed quality and whether children who attend more highly rated programs gain more in terms of school readiness over the course of a school year than children attending programs rated at lower

levels.

WECCS staff recruited a sample of family and group child care providers serving 3-5 year olds and participating in the YoungStar program in May of 2013 from the Northeast and Milwaukee YoungStar regions. In the winter of 2013-2014, study field staff were trained to observe classroom quality using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised and the Family Child Care Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R and FCCERS-R, jointly referred to as the Environment Rating Scale, ERS). The study field staff met high standards for reliability of their ratings compared with master coders. Of the 157 sites enrolled in the study, 155 programs were part of the observational ratings, with valid observations of 239 classrooms and family providers being completed by April of 2014.

Findings and Discussion

Results from analyses from the first part of the study of the data provide answers to two important questions about the validity of the YoungStar rating scale. First, the YoungStar star rating level does differentiate among programs of varying observed quality. In particular, programs rated as 2 Star had scores on the global ERS that were about 0.5 points lower than programs rated at 3 Star or above. These differences were statistically significant and meaningful, representing a fairly large proportion of the variation in score ratings (about half of a standard deviation). Yet, it is important to note that differences represent improvement within the range of minimal (ERS=3) to good (ERS=5) quality care. The study was not designed to test for differences in observed quality between programs at the higher end of the rating scale.

The second validation question answered by this study was whether the rating points that serve as the basis for the star level categorization also predicted a program's observed classroom quality. As expected, the total amount of rating points within each domain was highly correlated with points in other domains, and thus, each domain measures related aspects of program quality. Most importantly, the total number of points in each of the four rating domains (Education and Training, Learning Environment and Curriculum, Business and Professional Practices, and Child Health and Wellbeing) predicted observed classroom quality. With respect to total rating points, the difference in points between a 2 Star program (8.6 average points) and 4 Star program (28.8 average points) predicts a 1.2 point difference in ERS ratings, which translates into quite a substantial effect, given the amount of observed variation across programs (over a standard deviation).

The second part of the study, which will examine whether children who attend more highly rated programs gain more in terms of school readiness over the course of the a school year than children attending programs rated at lower levels, will be available in the spring of 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.

Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) were first created in 2003 and are now in their fourth edition. WMELS is the common framework that specifies developmental expectations for children from birth through entrance to first grade. They reflect attention to all the domains of a child's learning and development. Wisconsin has a robust, cross sector, professional development framework for implementing training on the standards. The system includes a WMELS coordinator, regional coordination, a 15-hour training format, and a parent engagement module. There are 95 state approved trainers representing a variety of early childhood sectors. Participation in this training is built into the YoungStar Quality Rating System with points generated to increase in rating levels. A process is in place for school districts to align WMELS with literacy and language arts state standards. A website for trainers and the general community can all be found on <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com>.

At the end of 2014, the WMELS Project Coordinator retired and a new coordinator was hired for this position. This change moved the contract source to the UW-Madison Waisman Center. This change began on November 1 with minimal impact to project timelines as we were able to retain the previous coordinator during the transition period. The contract was also changed to strengthen the role of the coordinator to give this role more authority over all decisions, consolidate data collection, increase the coordinator presence at community of practice meeting, increase collaboration with the Pyramid Model and PD Coordinators, and reactivate the WMELS trainer's listserv.

In 2014 the WMELS Leadership Committee expressed interest in redesigning their role. The committee worked at their 2015 meetings in February and April to take on a more active role in decision making related to "policies, practices, and training adaptations." The July meeting was the first time the new decision making role was implemented. The leadership committee approved the plan for the adaptations for the WMELS Tribal Trainers. This will be the basis of a process to approve adaptations to the content and training that are still consistent to the original content but allow for increased flexibility due to increased use of technology for delivery or for use in new venues including the university system and local school districts. The committee was honored to have the U.S. Departments of Health and Human Services and Education RTT Grant Managers attend their meeting during the monitoring visit. An August strategic planning meeting further refined the structure of the committee with vision and plans for the next several years.

Several priority areas were the focus of activity in 2015:

Increase the number of and support for WMELS trainers.

Early childhood trainers are an important part of Wisconsin's early childhood system, and through RTT-ELC we were able to increase the skill and knowledge base of our trainer community. While these standards have existed for a number of years, there is an ongoing need to continue to offer training to the field. We need trainers to make this happen. This is especially true in the child care sector as providers participating in the 15 hour training assists centers in maintaining or increasing their level in YoungStar.

There are a total of 95 approved WMELS trainers, including 6 who are associated with large school districts (Milwaukee, Madison, and Kenosha), 10 agency directors, site coordinators or site managers; and 21 instructors at WI Technical Colleges. The trainer approval process involves submission and approval of an application to the Regional Action Team, participating in a minimum of one 15 hour training, working with a mentor, and co-presenting the 15 hour training. Nine new trainers were approved and 7 new trainer candidates were accepted and assigned to mentors. These mentors helped assure consistency and best-practice adoption by new trainers. Mentors may be from agencies that define the role with job descriptions or from other independent trainers. Stipends are available for independent trainers to function in this role, and this year there were 6 mentor stipends awarded.

We want to build on the involvement of the Wisconsin higher education systems in the provision of WMELS training. A meeting was held with representatives of the WI Technical College, University of Wisconsin System, and Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. Each system has different capabilities to build WMELS training into their course structure, and we began identifying key actions needed. The technical college system has WMELS built into their common course work now. There is also a vision of how the more independent public and private university system could build WMELS completion into their programs. Personnel changes within the university system and DPI teacher licensing have interrupted this process.

We continued to support targeted training in Milwaukee and within tribal communities. These targeted trainings helped to deploy trainers to previously unreached areas and also helped identify more people who may be interested in becoming trainers. The Milwaukee project was a collaborative effort that targeted lower tiered programs and provided a no-cost training sponsored by the Milwaukee Area Technical College. The tribal project focused recruiting potential trainers from the tribal communities; this project is described in more detail in the APR section on tribal relations.

Provide support to existing trainers.

RTT 2015 included efforts to support existing trainers involved materials, resources, approval status, and communities of practice.

In order to conduct a 15 hour training, a wide array of materials and resources are necessary for the trainer. Training kits are checked out from a variety of locations for this purpose. We were able to inventory each kit and replace worn or lost items as well as update some of the out of date resources. In the past, trainers had to print and collate all of the participant handouts and that added cost and time to the trainer. We were able to print participant handout packets and now trainers can simply order the packets before the training. A new logo was designed and promotional banners with the logo and guiding principles were purchased and distributed to support the trainers' request for creating a better sense that this was a statewide initiative. These materials and resources were also reflected in website updates at WI Early Childhood Collaborating Partners (for both public pages and WMELS Approved Trainer log-in site). To support Latino speaking trainers and participants, we finished the translation of materials into Spanish.

The state requires WMELS trainers to be part of the Registry in order to be considered "approved." The Registry requires a fee for annual renewals that also adds costs to people willing to become trainers. RTT has allowed the state to cover the cost of these annual renewals. There is also a system in place to process renewals.

Regional Collaboration Coaches assured that WI Model Early Learning Standards Community of Practice (CoP) meetings were held in each region. The implementation of WMELS CoP events in each of Wisconsin's six regional communities of practice regions has increased consistency of regional coordination, improved coordination of training delivery, provided networking opportunities, and provided a venue for distributing information, updated material, evidence-based practices, and related resources. With the new WMELS Coordinator changes, the coordinator is participating in these events and building improved communication between trainers, the WMELS Leadership Team, and state decision makers.

The WMELS Trainer meeting was held December 3, 2015, to share and gather information from trainers. A number of areas were raised as important for the WMELS future structure. One area is the increasing variation in experience among trainers who have been in the system since the beginning and those that have been approved in the past years. Another area is the need to build flexibility in training format for diverse audiences while maintaining fidelity of content. Another structure area approaching is the impact at the end of RTT funding. WMELS is an important component of the RTT sustainability discussions and it was part of the January 2016 PDI and WMELS meetings.

Data collection.

The collection of accurate data has been an ongoing challenge with this project. There are several different points of data collection within the cross sectors involved in the project. While approved WMELS trainers are responsible for the provision of data about the number of trainings, the data remains segmented and all trainings are not reported. This issue was addressed in 2014 through several different means including the in-progress development of a more effective data reporting format and new linkages with the Registry. The online survey tool was redesigned for reporting, and it includes notification of training, trainer reports, and training evaluation. Quarterly, mid-year, and end of the year data summaries include: WMELS Training Efforts by Region, Participation by Region, and Overall Sector Participation. Data reports are publically available at <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/wmels-training-reports.php>.

In 2015, there were 40 full trainings reported throughout the regions. These trainings included 666 participants from a variety of sectors: child care (542), Head Start (53), public schools (36), and others (65). This data does not include trainings provided through our technical colleges or universities nor those provided specifically by school districts such as Milwaukee that provided training to all elementary schools. To address this issue, the WMELS Coordinator has developed a new online system for data collection and is working with the child care Registry to better align data collection.

Implemented Pyramid Model Sites to foster social and emotional development of children.

The social and emotional domain of WMELS remains a priority focus for the state effort, and the Pyramid Model for Social and Emotional Competence has been the primary focus of professional development in this area. The project has two coordinators; one is from a public education agency and the other from a nonprofit mental health agency. There is a state leadership team that meets quarterly to advise, guide, and support state implementation of the Pyramid Model.

A survey was developed to assess parents' impressions and experiences with implementation. The survey was distributed in February of 2015. Survey results were analyzed and shared at the state leadership team meeting in April. There were 463 families that participated in the survey, and 80% of participating families had children who were 4-5 years of age.

Training efforts continue in these Pyramid Model content and targeted audiences:

- Group Early Care and Education Content: 8 Part Series
- Family Resource/Parent Educators: Parents Interacting with Infants (PIWI), Positive Solutions for Families (PSF)
- Behavior Specialist: Pyramid Model Individualized Interventions (PMII)
- Program Leadership Team Content: TPOT Reliability Training, Team Refresher, Leadership Team Implementation Kick off

In 2015, the project supported 26 existing program-wide implementation sites (previously called demonstration sites). Seven new sites were also added. The Pyramid Model Implementation Academy was held in Wausau (May 2015). The Academy included the brand new TPOT reliability training, Implementation Refresher, team implementation meeting as well as two sections on parent module content open to the general public. Twenty-five (25) Pyramid Model content trainings were reported as completed between January and June 2015. Training content included the group care and education, parent education, home visiting, and intervention content. There were 501 participants involved in the trainings including group child care (183), Early/Head Start (23), public school (101), higher education students (57), and others (37). Training content included the group care and education, parent education, home visiting and intervention content. As noted in the WMELS description above, access to trainers is a key factor in the ability of these trainings to occur with fidelity. A rigor trainer approval process also occurs. In 2015, there were three new Pyramid Model trainers approved. There were also eight new Pyramid Model trainer candidates accepted and assigned to mentors.

Planning occurred in 2014 for program expansion using the RTT supplemental funding. Two areas of expansion have occurred. The first focused on expanding the number of programs and providers who received content specific and targeted training on social emotional development and application to practice. It also ensured the workforce had the resources needed to apply social emotional evidence-based practices through implementation of the Pyramid Model training and technical assistance structure. The July 22, 2015, Leadership Committee provided a draft grant notice process and form. Final review of the form occurred in August 2015. The application forms are being distributed in September 2015. Grants were reviewed in October. On November 5, 2015, eight communities received notification of funding.

The second set of grants supported communities in implementing Parent Interacting with Infants Groups in order to enhance parental competence and confidence, increase parental engagement, and provide optimal experiences for healthy brain development. The July 22, 2015, Leadership Committee provided the draft grant notice process and form. In August 2015 the application was sent out to Pyramid model communities via various listservs. The selection team is in place, and the process began September 22. In October, selection was finalized. On November 2, 2015, eight communities were notified of funding.

Seeing the success of the WMELS Communities of Practice (CoP), 2015 increased the focus on implementation of Pyramid Model CoP. Working in conjunction with the Regional Collaboration Coaches, the Regional Action Teams, and the WMELs CoP meetings, nine CoP meetings were held.

The Pyramid model maintains a strong relationship with Wisconsin's Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) system. The Wisconsin Pyramid Model Training and Coaching coordinator has served on the PBIS state leadership team, and the Wisconsin PBIS coordinator has served on the Pyramid Model Leadership team since 2010. They have presented together at various state leadership conferences, collaboratively developed materials, and cross walked the Pyramid Model and PBIS Benchmarks of Quality. These materials are available on the DPI and collaboratingpartners.com websites. (See http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/pbis_goes_to_preschool.pdf <http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/files/sped/pdf/ecspedldr-pyramid-pbis.pdf>.)

New focus on cross sector early literacy content and professional development.

The cross department Early Literacy Advisory Group (ELAG) continued in 2015 to promote the online literacy module created in 2014 through development and printing of brochures promoting early literacy (see <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/curriculum-assessment-emergent-literacy.php>). They sponsored a display booth and disseminated printed brochures at the annual WI Reading Association Convention held in Milwaukee and provided a session on universal and tiered literacy practices at the annual Preserving Early Childhood 4K Leadership Forum. A formal presentation with a request to review and edit literacy sessions for cultural competence was shared at the June 4, 2015, Inter-Tribal Child Care meeting (see the preceding APR section on tribal relations.) In June; the technology committee made recommendations that ELAG adopt the NAEYC-Fred Rogers Position Statement on technology uses with young children.

The 2015 RTT funding brought a focus to early math. After careful consideration of resources, the ELAG was asked to, and accepted, taking on the lead role in the development of an approach to promote early math concepts. The DPI math consultant was asked to become involved with the group and planning is underway for next steps in the development and promotion of early math resources and methods to align WMELS with the state math standards.

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.

WISCONSIN DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREAS C(2) OR C(3) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION. PAGES 42 of 109 THROUGH 44 of 109 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.

Family Engagement: Partnering with Families for the Success of Children

The Department of Children and Families recognizes the difficulties that are presented when trying to build effective and meaningful relationships with families. Wisconsin has placed emphasis on the importance of the relationships between early child care provider and the families that attend their program. In order to help early child care providers bridge the gap, the Family Engagement analyst worked very closely with University of Wisconsin Extension- Milwaukee to develop a comprehensive training that encompasses many aspects of family engagement. Some content areas include: definitions of family engagement, understanding parents and families, how to build relationships, strategies for engagement, and program action planning. This training is Registry approved meaning that providers are able to apply these hours to their continuing education hours. As of September 30, 2015 Race to the Top funding has supported 16 trainings for a total of 48 hours serving 255 participants.

Family Engagement Standards

The Family Engagement indicator for YoungStar is complete. The enhanced indicator is in YoungStar 2016 evaluation criteria as two optional points. Programs can earn one or two points by showing evidence of five (one point) or ten (two points) practices in family engagement. Programs have a total of 42 options in five categories. The five categories include transitioning, family engagement, family communication strategies, family support strategies, and family community connection strategies. In 2017 programs that are rated 3 Star will be required to earn one point and will have the option of earning the second point available. Programs that are rated 4 and 5 Star will be required to earn two points.

Family Engagement Additional Technical Consulting

The Department of Children and Families recognizes the importance of providing early child care programs with a variety of different supports. There were significant changes made to the family engagement indicator in YoungStar. Therefore, the Family Engagement Analyst worked with Supporting Families Together Association (SFTA) to amend the current YoungStar contract to include an additional two to four hours of on-site technical consultation, specifically focusing on family engagement practices. Race to the Top has provided funding to support 1,300 hours of family engagement on-site technical consulting.

As part of the additional consultation hours, programs will need to complete an application, agree to administer a short pre/post Family Engagement Survey to parents, and provide a letter of interest addressing the following questions: What needs do you hope to address with additional technical consultation, How do you see the additional technical consultation benefiting children, staff and parents, and How can you ensure that the program staff and leadership will be on board with increasing technical consultation regarding the topics listed above?

Parent Café Statewide Implementation

Supporting Families Together Association (SFTA) was awarded \$412,149 in Race to the Top funding to support two pieces in a Parent Café Initiative. The first piece included a contract with Be Strong Families to provide training around four learning objectives: understanding parent leadership, understanding communication and marketing, understanding the protective factors, and supporting professionals in reliability of the protective factors across the state. This training was completed July 22-24, 2015. Race to the Top provided funding to support the training of 40 participants across Wisconsin.

The second piece is to implement 30 Parent Cafés in 11 different counties across Wisconsin. The 11 counties include: Rock County, Lafayette County, Monroe County, St. Croix County, Sawyer County, Milwaukee County, Racine County, Winnebago County, Marquette County, Fond du Lac County, and Brown County.

Inclusion addition: In December 2015 the Family Engagement Analyst and the Inclusion Analyst teamed up to amend the Parent Café contract for an additional \$30,387 to include an additional three cafés that focus specifically on families and children with special needs and disabilities. The additional three areas include: Lacrosse, Madison, and Wausau.

Positive Solutions for Families Booklist

The Department of Children and Families has focused on a number of unique ways to support families throughout Wisconsin. Positive Solutions for Families (PSF) is a training that was originally developed by the Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL). Currently there are only eight trainers in Wisconsin that can hold a PSF session. In April 2016 Corporative Education Service Agency (CESA) 11 is sponsoring an event that will train an estimated 70 people in being certified to host PSF sessions across the state.

The Family Engagement Analyst in collaboration with CESA 11 will utilize Race to the Top funding to purchase a hundred books for the newly trained PSF hosts. These books will be used mainly in the children's portion of each session and will have an activity that accompanies the lesson in each book. Each story and activity mirrors the parent session. This is an intentional piece that Wisconsin added to the PSF sessions to promote child/family relationship building. The books are: Have You Filled A Bucket Today (parent session), Fill A Bucket (child session), Peanut Butter and Cupcake, Knuffle Bunny, David Gets In Trouble, Glad Monster-Sad Monster, Going on a Bear Hunt, Wave Goodbye, and Tucker Turtle (with coloring book).

Family Engagement at DPI

The Cross-Division family engagement workgroup within DPI used the resource mapping activities they began in 2014 to completely reinvent the "Families and Students" tab on the front page of the DPI website. The prominently placed tab now links to comprehensive "landing pages" which provide families, students, and interested community partners with easy-to-use information and data about DPI's activities and initiatives, as well as ways to get engaged in the process of creating caring communities for young people. This process of creating a new front page link has succeeded in aligning approaches and raising the visibility and importance of family engagement within the department.

Construction began in 2015 on an on-line "story site" to highlight exemplary strategies for family and community engagement in Wisconsin. This new family and community engagement site will be hosted by the Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners website, and will feature best practices from communities around the state. These stories will be linked to overarching frameworks and other resources, such as the Head Start Family and Community Engagement framework, so that practice and theory will be linked in an easy-to-use format. A related web site will provide information about family engagement professional development opportunities and resources in Wisconsin, this site is being developed in conjunction with the Wisconsin Early Childhood Professional Development Initiative

(PDI).

In 2015, we offered (and will continue to offer) workshops for recruiting and developing parent leaders at professional development opportunities that draw participation from many early childhood sectors, including at the annual Head Start Training Conference in February and the annual "Preserving Early Childhood" conference in March. In 2016, RTTT funds will be used to support the second year of the Wisconsin "Parent Ambassador" program, which is a year-long, intensive parent leadership training program for parent leaders who have children served by many early childhood sectors, including Head Start, 4-year-old kindergarten, home visiting, and private child care and education providers. The program is being administered through an inter-agency agreement between DPI and the University of Wisconsin --Milwaukee's (UW_M) Milwaukee Child Welfare Training Partnership. The plan is for the UW-M to sustain the program in future years, after RTTT funding has provided this one-year transition.

Coordination of family engagement and parent outreach efforts proceeded with frequent opportunities for dialogue among existing systems such as the DCF Family Engagement plan and the DPI K-12 Family/Community Partnership efforts. Workshops and conference sessions on family and community engagement were presented at several professional development events that occurred in the winter and spring of 2015, including the annual Wisconsin Head Start Association conference for Head Start directors and personnel; the Preserving Early Childhood conference targeting professionals engaged in 4-year-old kindergarten programs, as well as other sectors of Wisconsin's early childhood care and education; and the Finding Your Way conference, which brought together community-based teams of parents and professionals from a wide variety of sectors to engage in vibrant conversations about what really works in family and community engagement. Communities who put together cross-sector teams to participate in the Finding Your Way conference received pre-conference mini-grants to assess their current practice and prepare stories and questions to bring to the May event. Each of the ten communities that received a mini-grant produced a display highlighting their mission, strategic plan, and partnerships for promoting more effective family and community engagement. The conference was a huge success, and the theme for the 2016 Finding Your Way conference will again be family and community engagement.

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.

This project area focused on increasing coordination and alignment across the various sectors of early childhood professional development structures in Wisconsin, including but not limited to: child care, Head Start, four- and five-year-old kindergarten, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and C, home visiting, and higher education. This project is based on the concept that cross sector professional development will build common knowledge and increase skills while maximizing state resources. Much of this coordination work was (and will continue to be) overseen and coordinated by the grant-supported Professional Development Coordinator. This position is viewed as an "air traffic controller" for professional development at the state level. The coordinator organizes professional development activities to avoid overlap and conflict, maximize resource usage, and help maximize cross sector efforts. In 2015, after the initial coordinator resigned, this position was merged with the Standards Coordinator to start sustainability of positions after the grant ends. A management position was added to assist the newly framed coordinator position in the day to day implementation of the many projects. The various components of this project in 2014 are described in more detail below:

Supported regional Collaboration Coaches in their system coordination roles.

Similar to the role that the Professional Development Coordinator plays at a state level, Coordination Coaches provide critical "air traffic control" at a regional level by coordinating system development, trainings, technical assistance opportunities, and other relevant activities in each of six regions across the state and through the corresponding six Regional Action Teams (five regions plus Milwaukee). Their work increases collaboration, reduces redundancies, identifies gaps for further support, and helps make the system work more efficiently. WI Early Childhood Collaborating Partners (WECCP) Regional Collaboration Coaches and Networks is a cross department structure supported and aligned with RTT. Regional Collaboration Coaches have been in place since 2004 through braided funding efforts between all three Wisconsin state departments to connect, build, and sustain cross sector systems around state and regional priority areas. Through the regional action teams, Collaboration Coaches have enhanced cross sector collaboration in the areas of WI Model Early Learning Standards, Pyramid Model of Social Emotional Competence, Screening and Assessment, Homelessness/Poverty, and other areas. During 2014, the reporting mechanisms for collaboration coaches were refined, and in 2015 data collection and reporting continued to be a focus.

Coaches network with regional systems through Regional Action Teams. Regional Action Teams are made up of key representatives from the various early childhood sectors, agencies, and/or associations in each region. Each action team received an increased amount of funding through RTT to support their work. Regional mini-grants were one of the strategies used to allow local programs to benefit from the RTT funds and implement local projects that align with the professional development goals. More detailed efforts of the coaches will also be highlighted in the 2015 PD Consolidated Report. Information

about the Coaches and Regional Networks is housed on collaboratingpartners.com. (See <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/about.php>.)

Coaches also coordinated community of practice in each region to support consistency of regional coordination, improve coordination of training delivery, provide networking opportunities, and share information, updated materials, evidence-based practices, and related resources. These Communities of Practice grew in 2014 to include one-day events with practices meetings for Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards approved trainers in the morning and Pyramid model trainers in the afternoon. Some regions included screening and assessment within their community of practice structure. In 2015, the WMELS/PD coordinators began to regularly attend the communities of practice with the intent of providing a better local-regional-state communication structure for WMELS and cross sector professional development efforts as well as to improve the fidelity and effectiveness of the community of practice structure.

WI Early Childhood Cross Sector Professional Development Initiative (PDI)

The WI Early Childhood Cross Sector Professional Development Initiative (PDI) serves as the leadership, advisory, and working roles for the various components of projects defined above. It brings together the representatives from the various sectors of early childhood for regular opportunities to update each other on sector efforts, provide input into professional development activities, and to build collaborative projects and vision. In 2014, the PDI served as the professional development project team of the WI Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC). As the ECAC project team structure changed, PDI became an important component of the ECAC structure for "stakeholder" activities and recommendations. PDI quarterly meetings were held on January 20, April 9, July 23, and October 29, 2015. During 2015, PDI members were involved in development, review, and promotion of the cross sector activities described below.

WI Professional Development Systems Portfolio

The WI Professional Development Systems Portfolio was a concept that began as a written document with intentions of highlighting the efforts to strengthen professional development systems in Wisconsin. The concept grew into an online, interactive portfolio that would also serve as a cross sector multi-level infrastructure tool to enhance communication and coordination of the professional development system. This online portfolio would not replace other existing tracking systems in Wisconsin; it will be a way to store, track, and evaluate the various projects, committees, leadership, deliverables, documents, work plans, and training/ technical assistance materials. The Project Coordinator is housed at the UW Waisman Center, and a contract for Portfolio development exists with the University of Wisconsin Technology Services Department (fondly called, UW-DoIt).

In 2015, the project timeline was impacted by the retirement of the PD Coordinator, the resignation of the DCF representative, and the need for UW DoIT to hire development staff. Then working with the vision created in 2014, 2015 saw the Portfolio move from the design phase to the development and input phase. To assist with this delay, a written Portfolio was developed to describe the system. Full implementation and access is anticipated in early 2016.

The online design's paper prototypes were showcased at the 4/9/15 PDI meeting, and input was collected on the design and priorities for development. This allowed the finalization of the design for the forms, reports, and fillable data that will be accessed through the online modules. Then the project needed to create the process to collect the actual data that will be inputted into the Portfolio. The project encountered difficulty in finding a single application that can be used among all of the departments and cross sector stakeholders. The initial plan was to utilize the have "box" application utilized by UW-DoIt. After considerable efforts, this tool was not found to be easily accessible by the vast array of stakeholders who would be using the system. Google Docs was then considered since it was utilized by DPI and education partners, but DCF had restrictions in the use of Google. Finally, we began to explore "SharePoint" for this function. While it as not aligned with UW DoIt work, it was being used successfully across the departments by the ECIDS project. UW Do-It explored how they could

use this data collection point and finally at September and October professional development meetings, various coordinators received information on their role in the specific data collection and how to access the "SharePoint" application.

Professional Development Consolidated Reports (mid-year and end-of-year)

The Professional Development Report continued as a written format to capture the professional development efforts in specified areas including WI Model Early Learning Standards, Pyramid Model of Social Emotional Competence, and Homelessness/Poverty, Regional Collaboration Coaches and Networks, and many other areas. This report breaks down each area and includes a description, infrastructure, coordination, and other 2015 efforts. Because the goal is to use this report format to inform the Professional Development Systems.

WI Training and Technical Assistance Professional (T-TAP) Competencies, Courses, and Policy

Efforts continued in 2015 to strengthen the Wisconsin early childhood training and technical assistance (TTA) systems. The goal is to have statewide policies, competencies, and courses that guide, educate, and track a large segment of the training and technical assistance workforce.

In 2015, the Training and Technical Assistance (T-TAP) Competency Workgroup finalized the Wisconsin Training and Technical Assistance Professional (T-TAP) Competencies for Early Childhood and Related Professionals Working with Adults. This is a guide to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that training and technical assistance professionals should have in order to provide high quality training, mentoring, coaching, consultation, and counseling to those who work directly with children and families

The competencies began to be promoted through a basic six-hour T-TAP course which provides detailed guidance on the T-TAP competencies. Two additional six-hour courses are being developed; one for trainers and one for technical assistance. These courses will link to The Registry Professional Development Approval System and the WI Core Competencies.

The printed version in English and Spanish are now available and online (See: http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/documents/WI_TTAP_Competenciesfinal5_1_15.pdf)

The T/TAP Competency Workgroup continues to work with the Registry to further align the T/TAP competencies with the Registry Trainer and Consultant structure. They have decided to further promote the competencies through an inventory of best practices in training and technical assistance. The inventory of practice was reviewed on July 23, 2015, by the PDI Committee with many suggestions to format the content including the idea of making it an online document. The December 3 WMELS Statewide Community of Practice meeting included promotion of the Core and T/TAP Competencies.

Career Pathways, Articulation, and Credit for Prior Learning

In 2015, this project continued to address the articulation of degrees and coursework between two- and four-year Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) as well as addressing the need for credit for prior learning. This is addressing primarily the needs of the child care workforce in obtaining degrees and licenses to teach in four-year-old kindergarten, Head Start, and other settings that require a bachelor's degree and/or Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction teaching license. The Higher Education Workgroup utilized a 2015 work plan that included an articulation summit, mini-grants to IHEs, and created a more detailed database of early childhood degree programs, contacts, existing articulation agreements, and opportunities for progress towards a more coordinated career pathway system. Primary responsibility and funding was through the Wisconsin Early Childhood Association; RTT contributed to the mini-grants and staff for the efforts.

Systems building discussions occurred in April with leaders from the three higher education systems to discuss better ways of reflecting WMELS coursework so that it can be reflected in the Registry System.

May 4, 2015, was the state articulation meeting that was planned in conjunction with the other related professional development and higher education conference called, Intersecting Interests. This meeting brought higher education faculty together for further work on articulation and mini-grant efforts. It addressed higher education's role with the core competencies and the TA competencies. The event was also a sounding board to discuss an individual reporting process for reflecting WMELS coursework.

The grant work continues and plans are being made for the next state meeting in 2016. Planning meetings began on September 22, 2015, and the date was finalized for May 25-26, 2016. The event will have a two day focus, the first on higher education and the second on communities of practice. Planning continues on a regular basis.

Frame a Cross Sector, Comprehensive, and Consistent Approach to Learning Standards Domain Content

This project was aligned with other Race to the Top Projects (Tribal, B1, C1, C4) to frame a cross sector, comprehensive, and consistent approach to the professional development content and approaches including: early learning, classroom environment, inclusive practices for children with disabilities, homelessness, dual language learners, and screening/assessment. The PDI cross sector content scan was the original framework for this project, and it became the foundation for the design of the cross sector system portfolio described above. The 2015 activities and efforts are summarized below:

Inclusion: The inclusion workgroup in RTT Project B has become the lead on this area with the DCF RTT Inclusion/Special Needs Analyst as the lead coordinator. The staffing has changed but the work has continued with new personnel. IDEA Part B 619 and Part C play an active role. Part B 619 has designated the Preschool Options Coordinator as one of the co-leads. Throughout 2015, cross department inclusion work occurred through a large workgroup that included a number of providers and a smaller workgroup of state department staff. The Roles and Responsibilities in the Inclusive Childcare document was initially updated but continued to be a document that was being discussed before release. Throughout 2015, it has framed further discussion about ways for formal agreements between departments. The Preschool Options Inclusion Module took a renewed focus. We moved away from the existing articulate format and into a more accessible PowerPoint format. The modules that will include a total of 15 hours will also include an overview and numerous topical sessions of which six sessions are now complete. The DCF webpage on the topic for YoungStar which will align with collaboratingpartners.com and is now on the YoungStar website at <http://dcf.wisconsin.gov/youngstar/eci/default.htm>.

Homelessness: In conjunction with the McKinney-Vento Homeless program, a module is now available to promote better understanding of the impact of homelessness and poverty on young children and to share strategies for programs and communities. Bi-monthly email blasts, highlighting various aspects of the McKinney Vento Law and the challenges faced by homeless families with young children were delivered to a distribution list encompassing over 2000 recipients from cross sector interests, including school district liaisons, Early Childhood Special Educators, Birth to Three, Child Care, Head Start and Early Head Start, among others. These resources are also posted on the collaborating partners website <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/diversity-homelessness.php>. A total of Five (5) monthly email blasts centering on timely and pertinent topics were posted to the WECCP website and delivered to approximately 630 individuals per occurrence. Two tip sheets were developed and corresponding webinars were carried out on 2/1/15 (Identifying Homeless Children) and 4/8/15 (Partnering to Serve Homeless Children.). Arrangements have been made for the 6 regional collaboration coaches to attend the McKinney Vento Grant Funded districts meeting on November 4, 2015 in an effort to strengthen relationships between the coaches and the district liaisons.

Dual Language Learners: The Early Dual Language Learners (DLL) Initiative is being coordinated by WIDA including: statewide needs assessment, continued translations, improved coordination, and conducting professional development. The cross sector group, Early Dual Language Learners Initiative

(EDILL), continues to provide a structure to plan, advise, and evaluate the work. In 2015, the focus was on the development of a cadre of personnel trained in DLL that would be accessible to provide training in the various early childhood sectors. Their structure for creating the cadre include a seven session online module and two statewide summits. The summits would focus on DLL alignment with standards and would also be open to a wider array of stakeholders. There were 30 cadre applications approved, and the training is well underway. Each of these trainers is committed to do at least two trainings. The summits are scheduled for April and May of 2016. Resources are located on collaboratingpartners.com. (See: <http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/dual-language-learners-facts-and-tips.php>.)

Screening and Assessment: Consistent strategies, content, and professional development related to screening and assessment is another focus of this work. The project was specifically coordinated by the DPI funded Early Childhood Response to Intervention (Rtl) Coordinator with supplemental funds from RTT. This connection to the state's Rtl Center has played an important role in the comprehensive nature of the philosophy, the alignment with school district practices, and the potentials for sustainability. This connection has resulted in common and consistent early childhood resources on the Rtl website and a draft Rtl guidance document for school districts on how to assess early childhood in relationship to Rtl efforts. This project builds on the work of the cross department Healthy Children Project Team. In 2014, the Healthy Children Project Team served as the screening and assessment project team of the WI Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC). As the ECAC project team structure changed, the Healthy Children Committee became an important component of the ECAC structure for "stakeholder" activities and recommendations. The Healthy Children Committee has two workgroups addressing screening and assessment. The first workgroup is in the process of updating and promoting their Blueprint for Comprehensive Screening and Assessment. The original 2012 document has been revised to include descriptions of screening and assessment efforts, define gaps, and promote strategies to build the vision. Departments are currently in a formal review process. Using the ECIDS decision making process as a model, the report was taken first to DCF for more detailed review and feedback. This feedback and suggested revisions were approved by the committee on December 8, 2015. More detailed review is now occurring by the DCF YoungStar consultant and the DPI consultant on screening and literacy to bring it up to date with events that occurred during the year. After a January committee meeting, the revised documents will go back again to each department to determine an appropriate level of "buy-in" and adoption of suggested strategies. (For the original document see http://dcf.wi.gov/ecac/pdf/healthy_children_blueprint_2012.pdf) The second work group has focused on creation of professional development resources. It is in the process of using a web-based application to house these materials. This resource will include materials related to: 5 Purposes of Assessment, The Teaching Cycle, Principles of Ongoing Assessment, Engaging Families, Getting Started in Assessment, and Administrative Support in Assessment. It currently has sections on an overview of early childhood assessment, planning, and administrative support. (See <http://www.wiecpdonline.com/foundations-of-screening-and-assessment.html>). A third area of focus has been exploring how a comprehensive process and professional development plays out on the community level. A meeting was held on May 15, 2015, with a number of communities that were engaged at various stages in community wide strategies for screening and assessment. These communities shared their approaches with each other and representatives from the state agencies and ECIDS. They shared suggestions for next steps that will be used to consider the best approach to the allocated funding and how to promote community practices. On July 28, a conference call was held with the May 15 participants to talk more about ASQ. A listserv was created to promote information sharing. Several of these communities applied for the RTT public private funds. No clear next step has been defined for these mini-grants. Discussions with this project and the Rtl center in September 2015 have begun to frame a concept for mini-grants related to comprehensive screening and assessment with an Rtl framework.

Kindergarten Entrance Assessment (KEA): The Rtl Coordinator took the lead on this project and worked with a small workgroup of stakeholders representing several sectors. Wisconsin is not technically a KEA state but in our final RTT grant we committed to exploring KEA for Wisconsin. Since 97% of Wisconsin school districts have four-year old kindergarten, the work group decided to include a

focus on 4K as the kindergarten entrance point. Since we were working on the Blueprint for Comprehensive Screening and Assessment, the committee considered how a KEA would be a process that began before school entry and continued throughout the early grades. Several options are identified to consider for inclusion in the paper including: no state involvement, district voluntary with selection from several tools, district voluntary with required tool, district required from several tools, or district required from required tool. Their report has been developed and presented to two divisions within DPI sharing the options that were determined for action. Since screening and assessment is being addressed on many levels within departments, at the ECAC, and in the legislature, discussions are occurring about the best process to move forward with this work.

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.

WISCONSIN DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREAS D(2) OR E(1) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION. PAGES 55 of 131 THROUGH 59 of 131 HAVE BEEN DELETED

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

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

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

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

The ECIDS team was able to hit the ground running in 2015 and has made significant progress in all areas of the cross-agency project.

Three cross-agency work groups were formed, a research group, a technical group, and a data governance group. A cross-agency ECIDS Management Committee was also established in order to endorse project decisions and progress and represent agency positions at key points throughout the project.

The ECIDS Management Committee (EMC) approved two major recommendations from project staff in 2015. One recommendation dealt with a slate of three analytic questions, each requiring cross-agency data sharing, to guide the design of the ECIDS technical solution and demonstrate how the ECIDS could be used to address policy concerns. The second recommendation dealt with a strategy for building the ECIDS technical solution, meaning the hardware and software needed to compare records and identify unique individuals served by multiple agencies and to allow partner agencies to use this record matching system to fulfill individual data sharing requests.

In July 2015, the partner agencies hosted a day-long workshop on early childhood data privacy and confidentiality. At this workshop, leaders of the U. S. Department of Education's Privacy Technical Assistance Center led agency technical, policy and legal staff and program managers and data stewards through examinations of legal constraints that apply to sharing early childhood data and methods for creating sound data use agreements.

To help inform the design of the cross-agency technical solution for ECIDS, staff from the partner agencies interviewed designers and developers of integrated data systems in Utah and North Carolina and reviewed a presentation by Virginia. To varying degrees, these three states are farther along than Wisconsin in creating integrated systems and have features in their systems of interest to us.

ECIDS Staffing:

During 2014, key staffing vacancies hampered ECIDS progress. In 2015 the staffing picture has stabilized. To fill the portfolio management role, DPI assigned an existing staff to handle inter-agency coordination and hired a new ECIDS portfolio manager in August 2015. Both these individuals have deeper qualifications for the portfolio management role than the previous incumbents. The data governance work group lead has remained in place and has provided consistent leadership in this area. The technical solution work group leadership has been reorganized to take advantage of the guidance of technical leaders from all three partner agencies. A new highly qualified research workgroup lead joined the project in October of 2015 and will soon take full ownership of that work group.

ECIDS Technical Solution Work Group:

A specific approach for providing agency data for building the record matching program was decided upon. In addition, ECIDS project staff held discussions with the Department of Administration's Division of Enterprise Technology (DET) about housing the server for the ECIDS technical solution at DET. They also began planning the architecture of the technical solution. The technical environment is in the process of being set up at DET. The actual build of the technical solution will commence once the agencies have shared record matching data elements, pursuant to a data use agreement. The data use agreement is expected to be approved by all three agencies legal staff in the first quarter of 2016.

Also on the technical front, project staff decided on the data elements required from each agency to enable record-matching and agreed on CEDS (Common Educational Data Standard) as a common data standard. Staff also worked on mapping key process flows related to the technical solution, for example, how the technical solution data base would be initially populated and how it would be maintained, and how agencies would use the technical solution to obtain matched records for specific longitudinal data studies. Related to the key process flows, consideration will be given during 2016 to a possible user interface and tools to make sharing data between agencies faster, easier and more reliable.

ECIDS Data Governance Work Group:

Project staff focusing on data governance defined the types of data use agreements that would be needed to enable the technical solution to be built, maintain and use to fulfill specific data sharing requests. The data use agreement that would authorize the initial build of the technical solution has been drafted and should be approved during first quarter of 2016 by all three agencies legal staff. This group is also working on a comprehensive set of policies to ensure the security and quality of data accessed through the ECIDS and provide reliable means through which the ECIDS partners can make joint decisions on managing their collective data assets, during and after the grant project. As part of this work, it created an Early Childhood Data Access Policy that sets clear guidelines for who may have access to these data. A Data Governance Charter was created and approved. A joint governing and decision making structure (as well as processes around that structure) was developed, is being executed and being improved upon with use. A Master Data Sharing Agreement is to be completed during 2016 to streamline inter-agency data exchanges.

ECIDS Research Work Group:

Key to this group's work during 2015 was the approval of the three analytic questions by the EMC. This has allowed the work group to move forward. DCF chose to take on Distinct Count as their "analytic question". Distinct Count has to do with arriving at non-overlapping counts of unique individuals being served by one or more early childhood programs. This is an important component of a good ECIDS and can only be performed successfully with an integrated data system. A paper was completed by the work group proposing their approach. The next step is to define specific requirements and to enlist the data governance work group to draft a data use agreement for all three agencies to share data for the Distinct Count effort.

The DCF LIFT Data Warehouse

The Longitudinal Information for Family Touchpoints (LIFT) data warehouse made significant progress during 2015. The initial release of the warehouse, including a Distinct Count Dashboard of participation in each combination of selected DCF programs, is now in the final testing phase.

The objective of the LIFT project is to merge person and participation information from disparate DCF data warehouses to provide an overview of participation across DCF programs. The person records are matched to create a golden record for each person. The requirements for the first release were developed over several months and approved in May. The warehouse was subsequently designed, constructed, and passed System Testing.

A Reporting Workgroup, comprised of members from across DCF divisions, was established to provide consolidated LIFT reporting specifications. A Distinct Count dashboard was developed, among the Workgroup's reporting specifications for the initial LIFT release. The Data Governance structure was also completed, in conjunction with data stewards and Security.

The LIFT technical team wrote and tested a program to provide "exact matching" functionality for the initial LIFT data warehouse release, as mentioned above. In May, DCF purchased a license for software to provide advanced "fuzzy matching" entity resolution of person information from disparate DCF data sources. The State contracted with a vendor to provide expert implementation assistance and staff mentoring services. The application was installed and configured in a preproduction environment and will be implemented to production in the second release of LIFT.

The project entered User Acceptance Testing in December, leading to a projected February 29, 2016 full roll-out to production for LIFT 1.0. Planning began for the next release of the LIFT warehouse, expected in late 2016.

During 2015 the DCF RTTT Research Analysts completed a review of DCF data and initiatives related to the five key policy RTTT policy questions. This review was completed to better understand who is served by DCF and where additional data maybe be collected to get a more precise picture. Results of the review provided an overview of the department's data collection and analysis efforts.

DCF Research Analyst also contributed to the ECIDS cross-agency research workgroup in 2015. DCF is the agency leading the development of a cross-agency distinct count.

DCF developed the BPM Proposal for Defining Roles and Responsibilities for DCF Data Governance and Metadata along with many other data governance policies and documents related to both LIFT and participation of DCF in the ECIDS.

Department of Health Services and RTTT: Integrated Data System Build, Data Governance, Analytic Agenda

During 2015 Department of Health Services (DHS) made dramatic progress towards fulfilling our RTTT ECIDS goals and objectives. DHS staff with technical, data governance, and research subject matter expertise worked closely with DPI and DCF team members in the ECIDS workgroups to meet numerous cross-agency milestones. DHS internal teams achieved even greater success on our agency-specific milestones. DHS staff developed:

- Customer Hub integrated data system (in non-Production environments)
- Customized linking algorithm
- Interface application for users to access the Customer Hub
- Data Governance Board that meets monthly

- Internal data governance processes
- Internal Analytic Agenda

DHS is developing new analytic agenda practices that integrate the new Data Governance Board and processes as well as maximizes the benefits of the Customer Hub functionality. We will endeavor to align DHS internal processes with cross-agency ECIDS processes in order to streamline data requests for inter-agency analytic agenda questions and hopefully achieve efficiencies.

Since the end of 2015 the DHS Customer Hub is receiving regular (daily & weekly) feeds of demographic data from five of the six programs that DHS proposed for Project 10. And the sixth program began feeding data into the Customer Hub in mid-January 2016. The linking algorithm DHS developed successfully matches the records of any client who exists in more than one of these 6 participating programs. The Customer Hub is also generating a 'Golden Record' made up of the 'best' (most accurate/most recent) data from multiple programs. This record will be shared with the ECIDS 'Knowledge Base' integrated data system that DPI is developing. Throughout the spring of 2016 DHS is planning extensive user testing to verify:

- The Customer Hub system feeds (timing, completeness, accuracy)
- The accuracy of the linking algorithm using the source system data existing within the Customer Hub
- The validity of Golden Records compared to the original data within a program's source system.

User Guides are being developed along with an issue reporting system. Documentation of successful and unsuccessful test results will include screen shot documentation and retention as well as a progress and result tracking log. The test plan will include test scripts for users with different access roles and step-by-step instructions including screen shots. DHS anticipates that testing and any resulting fixes or enhancements will be completed in May 2016. During the summer of 2016 DHS plans to copy the Test environment into a Production environment and 'Go Live'.

Data Governance and Analytic Agenda

DHS sponsored one of the three questions in the approved ECIDS Cross-Departmental Analytic Plan. During 2015 DHS and DPI worked collaboratively to develop a question focusing on attendance/suspension rates for children having identified hearing loss. DHS identified the applicable cohorts and data fields/data elements within our two program source systems so after the planned Customer Hub 'Go Live' in summer 2016, records can be linked across both DHS programs. After the ECIDS data system and processes are finalized, DHS will request data from DPI. Then DHS analysts will complete their assessment, and will follow future ECIDS processes to disseminate the results to appropriate stakeholders within DHS and DPI. During 2016, while the ECIDS data system and processes are being developed, DHS will turn our focus to the internal analytic agenda approved by the Data Governance Board in 2015.

Our internal analytic agenda is comprised of eight questions on immunization and lead poisoning prevention and remediation. In addition to gathering and analyzing the data to address the questions, we will also pursue the design and development our internal ECIDS processes for the collection, compilation and dissemination of analysis results.

In order to perform a quality control test of the Customer Hub, we are taking one of our eight analytic agenda questions and completing it two times - once manually using existing processes, and then again using our Customer Hub and new internal ECIDS processes. The results from the manual process will help us validate that the Customer Hub data system is accurately and completely linking the records of the clients within the cohort. This strategy will also highlight ways we can improve our internal processes. After this test, DHS research analysts will leverage the Customer Hub to address the remaining seven questions. We anticipate that the functionality of the Customer Hub will greatly assist the epidemiologists and their programs.

Benefits of the new ECIDS processes and data systems will further validate the inherent sustainability of ECIDS. And initial successes will promote expansion of our analytic agenda in the near future,

maximizing our use of the ECIDS processes and Customer Hub tool within our agency.

Stakeholder Engagement & Sustainability

Throughout Project 10 the DHS project and team members have kept agency executive leadership regularly informed of our progress and achievements, and. In addition to numerous 'hands-on' opportunities for program staff, DHS holds multiple meetings every month with program leadership representing more than just the six participating programs. Our goal is to:

- Keep programs involved in design and development
- Share Project 10 updates
- Gather program feedback on new processes
- Gather feedback on existing usability and future business requirements for the Customer Hub.

These opportunities to engage stakeholders keep Project 10 in the forefront. Meetings, demonstrations of the Customer Hub, and reviews of processes and documents have resulted in the programs identifying new ways the Customer Hub can help them meet their own goals - particularly for case management, quality control, surveillance and performance assessment. We are also attempting to foster an increasing sense of ownership by the users by implementing the functionality and design enhancements that they suggest. These interactions with users build a strong foundation for the Customer Hub sustainability plan. Our future sustainability planning for the Customer Hub will include the added value to programs of these benefits. Measured increases in quality and efficiency will encourage additional programs to join the Customer Hub, which will further increase its overall value to DHS and ECIDS.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development.

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income¹ families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	40,833	10%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	40,833	10%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	94,187	23%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	175,853	43%

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

Data Table A(1)-1 Data Notes

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

411,076 young children (under 6) in Wisconsin according to the NCCP.

All data in this table is as reported by the National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP). NCCP sites their data source as the 2011-2013 American Community Survey, representing information from the years 2011 to 2013.

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 ¹	15,440	3.8%
Are English learners ²	1,527	0.4%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	2,952	0.7%
Are migrant ³	33	0%
Are homeless ⁴	469	0.1%
Are in foster care	2,417	0.6%
Other 1 as identified by the State	70	0.01%
<i>Describe:</i>	Are refugees	
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

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

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

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

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

Data Table A(1)-2 Data Notes

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

411,076 young children (under 6) in Wisconsin according to the NCCP.

Have disabilities or developmental delays:

Total kids reported by Part B, Part C, and Section 619

Are English learners

ISES 2014-15 Count Day Data (only includes children 3 years of age until kindergarten)

Reside on "Indian Lands"

These data were estimated the same way as the Year Two APR. Total Wisconsin Population Under 5 = 341,440. Total Population in Wisconsin = 5,742,713. Percent of Population Under 5 in Wisconsin = 5.9%. Total Population of American Indian/Alaskan Native in Wisconsin = 49,653. Estimate of American Indian/Alaska Native Children Under 5 = 2,952.

Are migrant

ISES 2014-15 Count Day Data (only includes children 3 years of age until kindergarten)

Are homeless

ISES 2014-15 Count Day Data (only includes children 3 years of age until kindergarten)

Are in foster care

eWISACWIS report for number of children in foster care at some point during 2015.

Are refugees

There data were estimated the same way as the Year Two APR. Calculations determined by Department of State Reports on Arrivals for 2014. 781 refugees arrived in Wisconsin. 8.94% of refugees in 2014 were under the age 5, for an estimated total of 70. Arrival figures do not reflect secondary migration. In addition, the children who may have been born to refugee parents during this time, but born in Wisconsin, are U.S. citizens, and therefore not included in this count.

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.

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool	0	0	56,008	56,008
<i>Specify:</i>	State-funded preschool			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	ISES 2014-15 Count Day Data			
Early Head Start and Head Start¹	1,270	2,840	14,444	18,554
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Office of Head Start Program Information Report (PIR) 2015			
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619	687	5,063	9,690	15,440
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	ISES 2014-15 Count Day Data and Birth to 3 Program Oct. 1 Child Count Report			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0	51,158	51,158
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	ISES 2014-15 Count Day Data			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	4,308	14,064	15,243	33,615
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Child Care Universe in Webl (Wisconsin State Administrative Data).			
Other 1	1,230	1,026	215	2,471
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	SPHERE Database			
Other 2	1,502	6,523	1,029	9,054
<i>Specify:</i>	Medicaid Therapy Services			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Medicaid Universe Database			
Other 3	8	54	321	383
<i>Specify:</i>	Children's LTS Waivers (non-autism)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Children's Long Term Waiver Database			
Other 4	0	10	489	499
<i>Specify:</i>	Children's LTS Waivers (autism)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Children's Long Term Waiver Database			
Other 5				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 6				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

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

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

¹ 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.

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	7,127	577	2,058	6,147	58	1,955	37,886
<i>Specify:</i>	State-Funded Preschool						
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	4,644	1,400	659	4,883	8	1,014	14,271
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	816	66	131	615	9	217	3,896
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,429	138	200	885	16	291	6,731
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	4,710	460	942	5,355	40	972	21,154
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	9,606	749	862	25,235	40	4,098	20,758
Other 1	475	95	65	349	2	168	801
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting						
Other 2							
<i>Describe:</i>							

¹ 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
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>							

Data Table A(1)-3b Data Notes

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

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
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start¹	\$5,775,000	\$5,775,000	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	
State-funded preschool	\$148,350,000	\$162,350,000	\$169,000,000	\$180,240,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	State School Aid Appropriation and 4K start up grants				
State contributions to IDEA Part C	\$20,968,343	\$23,158,380	\$21,256,965	\$21,082,198	
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$14,914,061	\$14,866,070	\$15,165,582	\$14,824,522	
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400	\$28,849,400	
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$217,030,087	\$161,334,925	\$170,666,677	\$174,263,010	
Other State contributions 1	\$3,881,300	\$4,032,234	\$3,221,996		
<i>Specify:</i>	School Based Services				
Other State contributions 2	\$9,778,200	\$11,062,453	\$11,211,677	\$8,198,332	
<i>Specify:</i>	MA Therapies				
Other State contributions 3	\$1,985,030			\$2,143,089	
<i>Specify:</i>	CLTS Waivers				
Other State contributions 4	\$781,158	\$1,148,552	\$985,700	\$1,571,400	
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting				
Other State contributions 5					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 6					
<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
Other State contributions 7					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 8					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Total State contributions:	\$452,312,579	\$412,577,014			

¹ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

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

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

Data Table A(1)-4 Data Notes

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

State contributions to IDEA Part C

The fiscal information is collected annual from local county Birth to 3 Programs through a reconciliation process. Data is then combined to show state contributions to the Part C Program.

School-based Services

Unable to determine how these figures were calculated in past years and therefore unable to determine spending in 2015.

CLTS Waivers

Children long term services data base. This database is used at DHS to track enrollment in children's long term care and the expenditures for each child enrolled.

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 Program¹					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
State-funded preschool <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	46,914	48,590	47,844	56,008	
<i>Specify:</i>	2014-15 school year				
Early Head Start and Head Start² <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	19,302	19,920	15,869	15,440	
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	22,458	0	21,906	15,440	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)</i>	79,443	46,996	51,158	51,158	
Programs receiving CCDF funds <i>(average monthly served)</i>	51,776	47,803	46,315	33,615	
Other 1					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 2					
<i>Describe:</i>					
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>					

¹ Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.

² Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Data Table A(1)-5 Data Notes

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

State-funded preschool

ISES 2014-15 Count Day Data

Early Head Start and Head Start

Office of Head Start Program Information Report 2014

Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and B, section 619

ISES 2014-15 Count Day Data and Birth to 3 Project Oct. 1 Child Count Report

Programs funded under Title 1 of ESEA

ISES 2014-15 Count Day Data

Programs receiving CCDF funds

Child Care Universe in WebI (Wisconsin State Administrative Data)

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.

No changes occurred in 2015.

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

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

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool					X
<i>Specify:</i>					
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	X	X	X	X	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	X	X		X	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	X	X			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X	X			
Programs receiving CCDF funds	X	X	X		
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)	X	X	X		
Tier 1					
Tier 2	X	X	X		
Tier 3	X	X	X		
Tier 4	X	X	X	X	
Tier 5	X	X	X	X	
State licensing requirements	X	X	X	X	X
Other 1	X		X	X	
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting				
Other 2					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
¹ 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
Other 6					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 7					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 8					
<i>Describe:</i>					

Data Table A(1)-7 Notes

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

There were no changes in 2015.

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.

All ten projects are moving forward with spending as expected.

The effects of initial delays in spending during the first two years of the grant can still be seen in a few projects. There are however, no concerns about our ability to complete the grant activities and spend the remaining funds. Once the 2016 budget is finalized plans will move forward to apply for a no-cost extension year in which to spend any remaining funds.

Budget figures often do not reflect actual or obligated spending as there can be a significant delay between obligation, expenditure, and accounting. We do not account funds as spent until they are processed by DCF. A significant number of projects are administered by other state agencies and community partners. Invoicing periods vary by entity, and there can be a delay of up to 6 months before invoices reach the DCF accounting system.

This delay was especially pronounced in 2015. Just before the 4th quarter of 2015 the entire state of Wisconsin made a change in accounting systems. The new system has resulted in a change to the way spending is tracked and reported. Delays in accounting were and remain significant while new tracking systems and reports are put in place.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs in 2015 that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2016, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established amendment process.

Project Budget 1

Project Name: Overall 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.

Spending on projects related to tribal communities and the public private partnership are both well underway at the end of 2015.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs in 2015 that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2016, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established amendment process.

Project Budget 2

Project Name: YoungStar Training and Technical Assistance

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.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated for activities either implemented in 2015 or planned for 2016.

There was some staff turnover that delayed spending in salary and related budget lines.

Some funds in this project may be impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs in 2015 that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2016, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established amendment process.

Project Budget 3

Project Name: Increase YoungStar Participation

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.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated for activities either implemented in 2015 or planned for 2016.

Some funds in this project may be impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated.

Project Budget 4

Project Name: Increase YoungStar Participation of High Needs Children

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.

All funds in this project are obligated in current contracts and will be spent by the end of 2016.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated.

Project Budget 5

Project Name: Increase Quality of YoungStar Program via Scholarships, Training and Bonu

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.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated for activities either implemented in 2015 or planned for 2016.

There was some staff turnover that delayed spending in salary and related budget lines.

Some funds in this project may be impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs in 2015 that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2016, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established amendment process.

Project Budget 6

Project Name: YoungStar Validation Study

Project Budget Narrative

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

All funds in this project are obligated in current contracts and will be spent by the end of 2016.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated.

Project Budget 7

Project Name: Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards

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.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated for activities either implemented in 2015 or planned for 2016.

Some funds in this project may be impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated.

Project Budget 8

Project Name: Family Engagement

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.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated for activities either implemented in 2015 or planned for 2016.

Some funds in this project may be impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated.

Project Budget 9

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.

All funds in this project are either spent or obligated for activities either implemented in 2015 or planned for 2016.

Some funds in this project may be impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated.

Project Budget 10

Project Name: Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System

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.

After much delay the spending for this project was as expected during 2015. All funds in this project are either spent or obligated for activities either implemented in 2015 or planned for 2016. There was some staff turnover that delayed spending in salary and related budget lines. Some funds in this project may be impacted by accounting delays described in the summary section.

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.

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the same activity in 2016 for which they were originally obligated. If there are underspent amounts from salary or related costs in 2015 that cannot be used for the same purpose in 2016, they will be used to expand and strengthen activities in the same project. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established amendment process.

Project Budget 11

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 WISCONSIN RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 10 PROJECTS.
PAGES 91-109 HAVE BEEN DELETED.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

RTT-ELC Budget Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$140,392.00	\$393,386.00	\$504,967.00	\$0.00	\$1,038,745.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$64,614.00	\$194,192.00	\$213,473.00	\$0.00	\$472,279.00
3. Travel	\$7,348.00	\$13,262.00	\$14,131.00	\$0.00	\$34,741.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$348,425.00	\$0.00	\$348,425.00
5. Supplies	\$78,040.00	\$253,817.00	\$283,849.00	\$0.00	\$615,706.00
6. Contractual	\$440,876.00	\$3,086,063.00	\$4,530,071.00	\$0.00	\$8,057,010.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$684.00	\$0.00	\$684.00
8. Other	\$1,661.00	\$4,703.00	\$27,175.00	\$0.00	\$33,539.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$732,931.00	\$3,945,423.00	\$5,922,775.00	\$0.00	\$10,601,129.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$2,137.00	\$5,571.00	\$29,245.00	\$0.00	\$36,953.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$1,290,935.00	\$1,961,272.00	\$1,497,153.00	\$0.00	\$4,749,360.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$1,226.00	\$12,854.00	\$46,050.00	\$0.00	\$60,130.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$2,027,229.00	\$5,925,120.00	\$7,495,223.00	\$0.00	\$15,447,572.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,023,665.00	\$1,167,914.00	\$560,941.00	\$0.00	\$2,752,520.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$3,050,894.00	\$7,093,034.00	\$8,056,164.00	\$0.00	\$18,200,092.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 1 - Grant Management

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$65,034.00	\$86,244.00	\$93,663.00	\$0.00	\$244,941.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,101.00	\$43,231.00	\$42,177.00	\$0.00	\$111,509.00
3. Travel	\$1,706.00	\$1,701.00	\$3,249.00	\$0.00	\$6,656.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$24,479.00	\$37,908.00	\$42,476.00	\$0.00	\$104,863.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$3,169.00	\$132,691.00	\$0.00	\$135,860.00
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)	\$117,320.00	\$172,253.00	\$314,256.00	\$0.00	\$603,829.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$173.00	\$302.00	\$2,775.00	\$0.00	\$3,250.00
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	\$1,226.00	\$12,854.00	\$46,050.00	\$0.00	\$60,130.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$118,719.00	\$185,409.00	\$363,081.00	\$0.00	\$667,209.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$16,857.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,857.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$135,576.00	\$185,409.00	\$363,081.00	\$0.00	\$684,066.00

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 - B(1)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$14,942.00	\$71,953.00	\$51,202.00	\$0.00	\$138,097.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$5,997.00	\$36,068.00	\$14,694.00	\$0.00	\$56,759.00
3. Travel	\$1,138.00	\$2,223.00	\$461.00	\$0.00	\$3,822.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$11,141.00	\$61,523.00	\$39,128.00	\$0.00	\$111,792.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$21,817.00	\$32,134.00	\$0.00	\$53,951.00
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)	\$33,218.00	\$193,584.00	\$137,619.00	\$0.00	\$364,421.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$80.00	\$475.00	\$219.00	\$0.00	\$774.00
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)	\$33,298.00	\$194,059.00	\$137,838.00	\$0.00	\$365,195.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$384,396.00	\$344,145.00	\$287,563.00	\$0.00	\$1,016,104.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$417,694.00	\$538,204.00	\$425,401.00	\$0.00	\$1,381,299.00

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 - B(2)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
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	\$4,703.00	\$8,441.00	\$0.00	\$13,144.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$8,441.00	\$0.00	\$13,144.00
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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$8,441.00	\$0.00	\$13,144.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$4,703.00	\$8,441.00	\$0.00	\$13,144.00

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 - B(3)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
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	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$166,242.00	\$0.00	\$403,661.00
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)	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$166,242.00	\$0.00	\$403,661.00
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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$166,242.00	\$0.00	\$403,661.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,598.00	\$235,821.00	\$166,242.00	\$0.00	\$403,661.00

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 - B(4)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$40,250.00	\$102,821.00	\$69,103.00	\$0.00	\$212,174.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$16,154.00	\$51,540.00	\$29,938.00	\$0.00	\$97,632.00
3. Travel	\$2,612.00	\$5,171.00	\$2,303.00	\$0.00	\$10,086.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$21,208.00	\$64,307.00	\$42,262.00	\$0.00	\$127,777.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$735,840.00	\$1,555,307.00	\$0.00	\$2,291,147.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$684.00	\$0.00	\$684.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$80,224.00	\$959,679.00	\$1,699,597.00	\$0.00	\$2,739,500.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$151.00	\$505.00	\$219.00	\$0.00	\$875.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$1,290,935.00	\$1,961,272.00	\$1,489,153.00	\$0.00	\$4,741,360.00
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)	\$1,371,310.00	\$2,921,456.00	\$3,188,969.00	\$0.00	\$7,481,735.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,371,310.00	\$2,921,456.00	\$3,188,969.00	\$0.00	\$7,481,735.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - B(5)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
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	\$517,642.00	\$107,358.00	\$0.00	\$625,000.00
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	\$517,642.00	\$107,358.00	\$0.00	\$625,000.00
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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$517,642.00	\$107,358.00	\$0.00	\$625,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$35,919.00	\$539,391.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$575,310.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$35,919.00	\$1,057,033.00	\$107,358.00	\$0.00	\$1,200,310.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 7 - C(1)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
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	\$653.00	\$0.00	\$653.00
6. Contractual	\$11,605.00	\$147,523.00	\$203,267.00	\$0.00	\$362,395.00
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)	\$11,605.00	\$147,523.00	\$203,920.00	\$0.00	\$363,048.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$1,728.00	\$5,500.00	\$0.00	\$7,228.00
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)	\$11,605.00	\$149,251.00	\$209,420.00	\$0.00	\$370,276.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$244,560.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$244,560.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$256,165.00	\$149,251.00	\$209,420.00	\$0.00	\$614,836.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 8 - C(4)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$20,166.00	\$55,165.00	\$72,327.00	\$0.00	\$147,658.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$16,362.00	\$29,033.00	\$36,049.00	\$0.00	\$81,444.00
3. Travel	\$1,757.00	\$3,712.00	\$1,028.00	\$0.00	\$6,497.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$21,212.00	\$37,470.00	\$48,140.00	\$0.00	\$106,822.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$12,527.00	\$97,300.00	\$0.00	\$109,827.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$17,637.00	\$0.00	\$17,637.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$59,497.00	\$137,907.00	\$272,481.00	\$0.00	\$469,885.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$120.00	\$661.00	\$3,967.00	\$0.00	\$4,748.00
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)	\$59,617.00	\$138,568.00	\$276,448.00	\$0.00	\$474,633.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$59,617.00	\$138,568.00	\$276,448.00	\$0.00	\$474,633.00

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 Task 9 - D(2)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
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	\$2,495.00	\$0.00	\$2,495.00
6. Contractual	\$65,482.00	\$115,853.00	\$208,211.00	\$0.00	\$389,546.00
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)	\$65,482.00	\$115,853.00	\$210,706.00	\$0.00	\$392,041.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,550.00	\$0.00	\$3,550.00
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)	\$65,482.00	\$115,853.00	\$214,256.00	\$0.00	\$395,591.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$72,748.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$72,748.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$138,230.00	\$115,853.00	\$214,256.00	\$0.00	\$468,339.00

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 Task 10 - E(2)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$77,203.00	\$218,672.00	\$0.00	\$295,875.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$34,320.00	\$90,615.00	\$0.00	\$124,935.00
3. Travel	\$135.00	\$455.00	\$7,090.00	\$0.00	\$7,680.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$348,425.00	\$0.00	\$348,425.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$52,609.00	\$108,695.00	\$0.00	\$161,304.00
6. Contractual	\$362,191.00	\$1,295,871.00	\$2,027,561.00	\$0.00	\$3,685,623.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$1,661.00	\$0.00	\$1,097.00	\$0.00	\$2,758.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$363,987.00	\$1,460,458.00	\$2,802,155.00	\$0.00	\$4,626,600.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$1,613.00	\$1,900.00	\$13,015.00	\$0.00	\$16,528.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00
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)	\$365,600.00	\$1,462,358.00	\$2,823,170.00	\$0.00	\$4,651,128.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$269,185.00	\$284,378.00	\$273,378.00	\$0.00	\$826,941.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$634,785.00	\$1,746,736.00	\$3,096,548.00	\$0.00	\$5,478,069.00

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.