

# 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**

**Minnesota**

2015

Due: February 29, 2016

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

**Paperwork Burden Statement**

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



## Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

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

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

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

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

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

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

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

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

E(2) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



## Performance Report: Cover Sheet

### General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A120019

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

3. Grantee Address 130 State Capitol, 75 Rev Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.  
City: St. Paul  
State: Minnesota Zip: 55155

4. Project Director Name: Bobbie Burnham  
Title: Director of Early Learning Services  
Phone #: (651) 582-8414 Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax #: (651) 797-1610  
Email: Bobbie.Burnham@state.mn.us

### Reporting Period Information

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

### Indirect Cost Information

#### 6. Indirect Costs

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

## Executive Summary

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

Minnesota has made great strides in year four of the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant to improve outcomes for children through increased access to high-quality services birth through grade three, with a focus on sustainability. Success has been driven through cross-agency partnerships between the Minnesota Departments of Education, Health, and Human Services and the support of stakeholders, including Minnesota's four Transformation Zones: Itasca County, Northside Achievement Zone of Minneapolis, Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood and White Earth Tribal Nation.

Accomplishments in 2015 include expanding Parent Aware ratings to all Minnesota counties; continuing to revise the early learning standards; completing a new Minnesota Infant/Toddler Credential and additional training; launching the Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System website and re-branding the new kindergarten entrance assessment: the Minnesota Kindergarten Entry Profile.

The state prioritizes work into the components of a successful state system, including: High Quality, Accountable Programs; Increased Access to High-Quality; Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children; Great Early Childhood Workforce; and Measuring Outcomes and Progress. Accomplishments are evident across components. The executive summary will share accomplishments, challenges and proposed solutions to identified challenges in each of the five components.

### High Quality, Accountable Programs

Minnesota's commitment to high-quality, accountable programs is demonstrated through Parent Aware, the state's voluntary Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System for early care and education programs.

In 2015, Minnesota made measurable progress in promoting program participation in Parent Aware. On January 1, 2015, full ratings for programs became available statewide. Five Parent Aware recruiters continued to work in local communities to strategically disseminate information on Parent Aware to early learning and development programs. Recruiters use community organizing principles and receive ongoing training on how to reach "hard to reach" communities and use Nation Builder (web-based data system) to track their communications with programs. These positions are allowing quality coaches to specialize in engaging with programs to improve their quality.

We are proud of our progress in increasing the number and percentage of ELD programs participating in the statewide TQRIS in year four of the grant. The total number of rated programs has increased each year of statewide implementation from 2012 to 2015: 529, 1322, 1892 and 2434 programs were rated each year, respectively. In addition, Minnesota made strong progress in maintaining and increasing the number of children with high needs enrolled in highly rated ELD programs.

Child Care Health Consultants (CCHC) also impact quality in early learning environments and facilitate the health and development of children, families and staff. In 2015, CCHCs in the two rural Transformation Zones documented 239 points of contact with Parent Aware participating providers, 46 on-site visits, 75 telephone calls, and 113 electronic communications. Some examples of CCHC activities provided include linking families with community resources for health and social needs, collaborating on the development of improvement plans using health and safety standards from *Caring for Our Children*, and providing training and health education materials for children, parents and staff. Maintaining CCHC staffing was a challenge in three of the four zones during this reporting period. Efforts to recruit and train another CCHC were successful in one zone; services will resume in February 2016. Because of the challenges experienced with providing CCHC services in the two

metro zones, plans are to provide health and safety training to family child care providers and family friends and neighbors in 2016. Efforts will be targeted to non-English speaking communities.

### **Increased Access to High Quality**

Minnesota's approach to increasing access to high-quality early childhood education and care programs by children with high needs is two-fold. First, early learning scholarships are provided to families to financially support access to high quality programs participating in Parent Aware. Secondly, Title I Pre-K Incentive grants are provided to school districts who contribute Title I funds to support high-quality early childhood programming. These initiatives occurred in four geographic areas, or Transformation Zones, across Minnesota selected by MDE: the Northside Achievement Zone (NAZ) in Minneapolis, the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood (SPPN) in Saint Paul, Itasca County, and White Earth Nation.

Across the four Transformation Zones, 270 children were served with scholarships throughout 2015 and 964 have been served over the period of the grant. Transformation Zones report that they have involved more children in high-quality early childhood programs, resulting in promising outcomes.

Minnesota completed the spring child-level assessments in 2015 to evaluate the impact of high quality early learning programs accessed through scholarships has on children's outcomes. Final evaluation results will be released in the winter and spring of 2016.

In efforts to provide continuity for all RTT scholarship recipients, 102 eligible children from the Transformation Zones were transitioned to the state scholarship program. Fifty children not yet meeting state eligibility requirements will remain on RTT scholarships through June 30, 2016 at which time most will be eligible to transfer to the state scholarship funding.

In this final year of the Pre-K Title I Incentive project, districts turned their focus to the future, focusing on quality and sustainability. Twenty-seven school districts, including two charter schools, are utilizing Title I funds and Title I Pre-K Incentives. Districts have reported many positive outcomes from the grant, including improved coordination between early childhood and K-12, and improved relationships not only within the school district but also between the district and families and community partners. Sustainability will continue to be a challenge due to budget pressures. To support districts, Minnesota developed a web page for grant recipients with resources and strategies. Minnesota also targeted Title I Pre-K Incentive grant schools for a Pre-K through Grade 3 Principal Leadership Series focused on building principals' competencies to effectively lead Pre-K-3 efforts.

In May 2015, the Department of Human Services (DHS) contracted with First Children's Finance to create business advisory councils that connect private sector representatives to local child care initiatives to support and provide technical assistance to quality child care programs in rural communities. The focus is on rural Minnesota as these communities have unique child care challenges. First Children's Finance has spoken at six rural community gatherings about how child care and economic development are linked and how private-public partnerships can increase the supply of high quality care. These community events stir the private sector into action. For example, as a result of the community event in Morris, Minnesota one local business owner committed funding to pay for training that child care providers need to maintain licensing requirements and advance in the Parent Aware Quality Rating and Improvement System.

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

Minnesota supports early learning and development outcomes for children by first defining what children are expected to know and do across multiple domains and at different stages of development, then working to have a structure in place to screen and assess individual children and their



environments and programs. This is done through the revision of the Early Childhood Indicators of Progress: Minnesota's Early Learning Standards (ECIP); the Comprehensive Assessment System; and Early Childhood Screening.

In 2015, Minnesota began revising the science and math standards. The revision process followed the same successful model that was used in the revision of the language, literacy and communication, and social and emotional domains that were done in 2014. Both the science and the math standards revisions will be completed in March 2016. The remaining domains: creativity and the arts, approaches to learning, social systems and physical development will be revised summer 2016.

To promote the use of the new early learning standards, Minnesota is contracting with the Center for Early Education and Development at the University of Minnesota to develop training for trainers. This training is designed to help trainers embed the standards in all the training they are already doing.

The Comprehensive Assessment System works to support an early childhood system of measurement with decision making across settings and points in time. Minnesota's efforts around the development of a Comprehensive Assessment System include helping early childhood programs understand the "why," "what" and "how" of assessment and ensuring they have the tools to implement assessments appropriately and use the data in order to adapt their instruction and improve outcomes for children. In 2015, Minnesota continued to make considerable progress on the early childhood Comprehensive Assessment System including implementation of multiple online resources, supports for training and coaching and expansion of the system in grades K-3.

Minnesota completed a draft of uniform review criteria by which all early learning assessments for the kindergarten entry assessment, early childhood special education (ECSE) and comprehensive assessments will be examined in the future. Minnesota also completed the building of an online tool finder to assist early learning programs with choosing an appropriate assessment tool. This finder is designed to match respondents with assessments based on their needs via an online algorithm. The tool finder currently includes all Parent Aware approved tools and kindergarten entry assessments.

In partnership with the University of Minnesota, the state completed work on a series of hybrid learning modules that focus on authentic assessment for special topics. Early learning programs can access in-depth face-to-face training or view online overview of content across a variety of topics including embedding authentic assessment into everyday practice, involving families in the assessment process, support for administrators and more. In order to ensure the information captured in the online modules is translated into K-3 friendly terms, MDE is reproducing four of the previously mentioned modules for K-3 audiences. These online resources will be completed by December 2016.

Another component of monitoring children's progress is ensuring they receive developmental and social-emotional screening in order to flag developmental concerns early and refer children to appropriate services. Minnesota has experienced many successes and several challenges during the first six months of actively piloting an electronic screening initiative.

Successes include pilot sites have documented that they are able to screen more children using the electronic system versus paper and 90 percent or more of the staff reported satisfaction with using the electronic screening system. Additionally, a high percentage of families have reported that the electronic system is easy to use and that it helped them understand and support their child's growth and development. A few pilot sites have experienced unanticipated technical challenges relating to their local IT resource capacity; full implementation for these sites is expected by early March 2016.

Most pilot sites experienced internal IT barriers/capacity, which led to a significant delay in getting the sites up and running. For example, many local IT services were reluctant to put a new software and data on their servers or there was a protocol to having IT committed to spend time on this project that wasn't planned for adequately in advance. Additionally, during the first several months, there were

frequent electronic screening system glitches that needed to be addressed before the sites could move forward. Patient Tools Inc. has been very responsive and has correctly glitches as they come up.

## **Great Early Childhood Workforce**

Since the release of *Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework for Early Childhood Professionals* in 2014, the focus in year four has turned to implementation of the revised framework, through consultation with institutes of higher education on its content; development and delivery of training for trainers and practitioners; alignment of the new framework with the Professional Development Registry and Minnesota's Career Lattice; and promotion of the framework to early childhood practitioners, trainers and institutes of higher education.

As an additional support, companion guides to accompany the Family Child Care and Preschool versions of the framework have recently been completed and posted on the MDE website. Companion guides combine the key concepts found in the framework with suggestions and examples of what it might look like in an early childhood setting. They are intended to help people working with young children have a beginning understanding of what to do. In partnership with these efforts, DHS is working to align training and supports for the early childhood community with the framework.

After the 2014 revision of the Minnesota Child Care Credential, Minnesota saw a large increase in interest in the revised credential and thus a significant increase in completion rates in 2015 compared to previous years. Additionally, development of the Minnesota Infant/Toddler Credential (MNITC) has been completed and English and Spanish cohorts are scheduled to begin in early spring 2016. Overall, we are proud of our continued progress to meet or exceed our targets to support early childhood educators in progressing to higher levels of credentials and degrees.

MDE staff created a toolkit of over 300 existing early childhood resources to be used to guide and support providers. The toolkit provides resources that align to CCDF reauthorization requirements. Resources include topics such as home safety, health and school readiness. Effort was made to include translated materials in Spanish, Somali and Hmong. In 2015, MDE branded this as the Early Childhood Resource Directory and partnered with DHS and Child Care Aware of Minnesota to make the directory available online.

These combined efforts, carried out in coordination with other state initiatives, continue progress toward ensuring our youngest learners are in high-quality environments with highly skilled adults who teach and care for them.

## **Measuring Outcomes and Progress**

Minnesota is working toward increasing measurement and use of data to better understand children's early experiences and answer broad and meaningful questions about outcomes for Minnesota's youngest children. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System (ECLDS) and revised Kindergarten Entrance Assessment will enhance the state's ability to answer these questions and improve children's earliest experiences.

In 2015, Minnesota made great progress in the ECLDS, resulting in the launch of the new ECLDS website at the end of January 2016. Challenges faced were similar to many states with a late start in the work, delays in hiring initial teams, and relationship-building between departments in navigating the construction of data-sharing agreements and governance structures. Timing challenges were addressed by engaging in sound project planning principles and practices. In terms of relationship-building, the cultivation of functional relationships across agencies has supported the work of the ECLDS, which has required persistence and regular check-ins about goals and the obligations to the grant. Establishing commitment to the end product was essential to maintaining forward momentum.



One measure that has received a lot of attention in Minnesota is school readiness of children as they enter kindergarten. In 2015, after completing its two-phase kindergarten entrance assessment pilot, Minnesota began implementing the Kindergarten Entry Profile (KEP), which is designed as a tool to measure children's status on the state early learning standards beginning at kindergarten entry. In order to do this, the menu of tools from which districts can choose underwent a substantial amount of rigorous alignment and validity testing, paying close attention to the domain coverage of the standards. As a result, Minnesota has adopted the following tools: Desired Results Developmental Profile - Kindergarten; Formative Assessment System for Teachers; Teaching Strategies Gold; and Work Sampling System - Minnesota Adapted Version.

## **Transformation Zones**

Minnesota has focused a majority of its Race to the Top efforts in four high poverty communities that represent diverse populations in our state. The four Transformation Zones provided Minnesota with the opportunity to differentiate strategies based on key factors of each community including location to an urban center and demographics of the population. Additionally, the close work with the Transformation Zones provided strong feedback to the state regarding the impacts of the Race to the Top efforts in each of the diverse communities on increasing access to high quality early childhood programs.

Over the four years of the grant, Transformation Zones have stressed the huge benefit of having the flexibility to design their own programs with the RTT-ELC grant. They see a great value in building on their knowledge of their local area's systems and relationships to develop their scholarship programs. Flexibility was also key in helping families with complex needs. Zone's found that they at times needed to be able to work with families on a case-by-case basis and they were able to establish their processes to allow for that individualization.

The work with the Transformation Zones also provided essential feedback to the state on implementation and policy decisions that were producing positive outcomes or facing local challenges. All Zones indicated that the RTT-ELC efforts in their area led to an increase of collaboration across stakeholders and providers and brought a new level of emphasis to the importance of high quality early childhood experiences in their area. Challenges faced by the the Zones included transportation issues, lack of providers, isolation of providers and a lack of physical space to expand classrooms. Some of these challenges were resolved over the time of grant like the increased participation of child care providers in Parent Aware or the use of Title I Incentive funds for transportation. However, other challenges will take longer and additional state and local resources to provide long-term solutions like the building of new spaces for programs.

## **Conclusion**

The state of Minnesota is committed to ensuring that all children get the great start they need to succeed in school and life. The state has actively leveraged Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant funds, along with public and private local investments, to expand and support programs and initiatives; build and maintain quality early care and learning environments; and ensure access through robust outreach efforts and supports to families with high needs. Through coordinated efforts among our three core agencies: Education, Health, and Human Services and bipartisan support from leadership across sectors, Minnesota is well positioned to benefit from these investments for years to come.

## 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).

There was change in Minnesota's governance structure since the 2012 APR submission.

Minnesota's application described three key governance structures: the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (Early Learning Council), the Children's Cabinet, and the Office of Early Learning (OEL). Each of these structures includes an explicit focus on children from birth to grade three (Early Learning Council and Office of Early Learning) and beyond (Children's Cabinet focus includes birth to workforce entry). Each of these structures was implemented under the direction of Governor Mark Dayton, who has demonstrated a strong commitment to the early learning and development of children since before he took office. The governor institutionalized that commitment by issuing "Better Schools for a Better Minnesota: 7 Point Plan for Achieving Excellence."

Over the last year we have transitioned the Office of Early Learning in with the Governor's Children's Cabinet so that now they are one entity operating under the direction of the governor and his staff. The Minnesota Children's Cabinet is designated as the cross-agency leadership team for programs serving children and youth, and includes the commissioners of education, health, and human services. This cabinet, led by the director of the Children's Cabinet, meets regularly to coordinate goals, make strategic decisions, and direct state services, programs, and funds in an efficient manner for children of all ages, building strong connections between systems and programs that focus on children birth to eight and the K-12 system.

The Early Learning Council and the Children's Cabinet are important points of stakeholder input and cabinet level decision making, but the day-to-day coordination and alignment of Minnesota's early childhood system falls under the cross-agency leadership team consisting of upper management staff from the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services.

The governor has designated the Department of Education as the lead agency for coordination of the State RTT-ELC Plan, through the the division of Early Learning Services. Commissioners from the three state agencies comprising the Children's Cabinet have each signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOU), delineating roles and responsibilities under the State Plan.

The Cross-Agency Leadership Team includes the director of the Children's Cabinet and agency directors who oversee programs currently housed in the Departments of Education, Human Services, and Health. The Leadership Team collectively has responsibility for making recommendations to their respective commissioners regarding policy, budgeting, and rulemaking across the scope of programs currently housed in all three agencies to reduce fragmentation and improve services for young children and their families.

Additionally, the State Plan is monitored and coordinated on a daily basis by the RTT-ELC project manager. The project manager is guided by the RTT-ELC Leadership Implementation Team, which includes the Cross-Agency Leadership Team and supervisors from each of the three agencies. The team meets on a monthly basis to review progress, ensure coordination across agencies and projects, assess potential risks, and provide direction on the overall State Plan.

## **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.

Minnesota has leveraged local expertise and leaders to implement the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant and ensure that the products and initiatives from the grant are useful and sustainable for the audiences served.

The implementation of Minnesota's State Plan was developed in a manner that incorporates multiple feedback loops from participating programs, early childhood educators, funders, and other key stakeholders in the implementation of activities under the grant. All major initiatives in the grant include a cross-sector and cross-agency approach to solicit feedback. These advisory groups are a part of all the components of Minnesota's State Plan, including: Parent Aware (Minnesota's TQRIS), Early Childhood Screening, Early Learning Scholarships, Early Learning Standards, Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System, Workforce Development, Comprehensive Assessment System, and Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

As examples, Parent Aware is guided by a governance structure that includes an advisory group that is made up of representatives from participating programs, the early childhood educator workforce, implementation partners, the Early Learning Council and leaders from each of the four Transformation Zones. The Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment workgroup includes representatives from early childhood, K-12 and English learners. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System's governing body includes stakeholders from organizations that primarily collect data that will be included in the system, including cross membership with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System.

Moreover, each Transformation Zone has a leadership body that helps to determine policy decisions for initiatives affecting the Transformation Zone and is actively engaged with implementation decisions regarding many RTT-ELC activities. Minnesota holds quarterly meetings with the Transformation Zones to communicate progress on grant activities, receive feedback on implementation, and work collaboratively to resolve challenges across Transformation Zones and within a specific Transformation Zone.

Stakeholders are also involved with supporting and carrying out some of the activities included in the Statement of Work. The nonprofit organization Parent Aware for School Readiness (PASR) is involved in the communication and promotion of Parent Aware and is funding a portion of the Parent Aware Evaluation in conjunction with the Greater Twin Cities United Way. Both PASR and the Greater Twin Cities United Way have been partners with the state agencies in the implementation of these activities.

State and local Child Care Aware of Minnesota agencies that make up Minnesota's child care resource and referral system have contract responsibilities for recruiting and supporting licensed child care programs in Parent Aware, providing consumer information to parents, supporting trainers and delivering training and coaching aligned with the Knowledge and Competency Framework and meeting Parent Aware training requirements to Minnesota's child care providers. Representatives from Child Care Aware of Minnesota also serve on the Comprehensive Assessment System advisory group.

Minnesota has also been coordinating and seeking feedback from stakeholders in rural communities throughout Minnesota including the Minnesota Initiative Foundation leaders who have been included in conversations regarding continuous improvements on a variety of efforts including Parent Aware, Early Learning Scholarships, Title I Pre-K Incentives, Great Workforce Initiatives, and the Comprehensive

## Assessment System.

In November 2015, MDE, MDH, DHS and the governor's Children's Cabinet partnered with the Minnesota Initiative Foundations and Minnesota's Future to host regional community listening sessions to learn how our state can be more effective in linking policies, programs and practices to ensure every child in Minnesota has a high-quality early education. Over 600 people attended these sessions. In December, a survey was sent out covering the same topics, which received over 2,000 responses. Kathy Thornburg from the federal Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge TA team facilitated the sessions. She also reviewed the findings from the listening sessions and the survey and provided a summary report that included recommendations on what Minnesota can do moving forward. Stakeholders throughout the state were very thankful for the opportunity to gather and discuss these important issues.

The Greater Twin Cities United Way and the McKnight Foundation have continued to sponsor efforts to promote coordination and collaboration with other initiatives occurring in the state of Minnesota, including the federal Promise Neighborhood and I3 grants, the Social Innovation Fund grant, the local STRIVE Initiative, and the Accreditation Facilitation Project. One component of this work is the Learn Together Minnesota website for stakeholders to learn more about and follow the progress of each of these grants over the grant period. They also have partnered with Minnesota Department of Education and Minnesota Elementary School Principal Association to support a statewide Pre-K-Third Grade Leadership Training series.

## **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.

Over the course of the RTT-ELC grant, Minnesota has increased state investments in early childhood programs and services by leaps and bounds. After nearly a decade of flat funding in early childhood, in 2013, the Minnesota legislature increased spending for early childhood programs and services by approximately \$59.4 million dollars over the next biennium (two year budgeting cycle). The 2013 legislative session also included state funding for all day kindergarten to the tune of approximately \$301.2 million a biennium.

The following year, the 2014 Minnesota legislative session continued further investment in young children in Minnesota with a supplementary \$20.76 million a year. On top of these increases, the 2015 Minnesota Legislature added an additional \$95.5 million for the 2016-2017 biennium. These increases over the last three years have totaled approximately \$100 million a year in new funding for early childhood programs and services.

In the 2015 Legislative Session, the Minnesota Legislature allocated funding for the Parent Aware Quality Rating and Improvement System, the first appropriation for this purpose. \$1.2 million was appropriated for fiscal year 2016, \$2.3 million for fiscal year 2017 and \$1.75 million in base funding for future years. These new funds support Parent Aware along with an on-going commitment of \$2.5 million in federal Child Care Development Fund funding through DHS.

The 2015 session also included an additional \$30.8 million for School Readiness, Minnesota's state funded preschool program and a \$48.3 million increase for the Early Learning Scholarship program. State funding for Head Start was also increased from \$20 million to \$25 million a year.

**Participating State Agencies**

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

There are no changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in Minnesota's State Plan.



## 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.

In 2015, Minnesota made progress toward revising the TQRIS standards by:

- Reviewing research and meeting with content experts to elicit ideas for updating the TQRIS standards.
- Creating a crosswalk of standards by program type.
- Conducting a public input process.
- Reviewing the Parent Aware Validation Report, issued in February 2016, and working with the evaluation team to clarify the findings.
- Creating a synthesis of findings from the content expert meetings, the Parent Aware Validation Report, and the public input process.

Due to Minnesota's approved no-cost extension, Minnesota is able to take more time to process the information collected in 2015, and make final decisions around updates to the TQRIS standards in 2016. Ratings using a revised set of indicators are expected to be available starting in July 2017.

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

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

Minnesota made significant progress in increasing the market penetration of TQRIS. On January 1, 2015, Minnesota, with help from its implementation partners, made Parent Aware available to all licensed child care programs, school-based pre-kindergarten programs, Head Starts, and early childhood special education programs in the state. This means that we expanded the availability of Parent Aware to non-accredited licensed child care programs to 43 remaining counties and three tribes.

Recruitment of licensed child care programs, both accredited and non-accredited, is a contract responsibility of Child Care Aware, Minnesota's child care resource and referral system. This system is charged with collaborating with a variety of partners to prioritize the recruitment of programs that serve children receiving child care assistance and coordinate unified messaging to programs on the benefits of participating in Parent Aware. Five Parent Aware recruiters continued to work in local communities to strategically disseminate information on Parent Aware to early learning and development programs. Recruiters use community organizing principles and receive ongoing training on how to reach "hard to reach" communities and use Nation Builder (web-based data system) to track their communications with programs. These positions are allowing quality coaches to specialize in engaging with programs to improve their quality. Support for the recruiter positions is included in Minnesota's no-cost extension.

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) is responsible for recruiting state-funded preschool programs, Early Head Start and Head Start Programs, Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619, and Charter Schools. Recruitment activities include presentation to programs at statewide conferences, visits to local school districts, inclusion of Parent Aware rating information with other communications to school districts and Head Starts and one-on-one follow-up. MDE is also responsible for providing technical assistance to these programs during the rating process.

Parent Aware for School Readiness collaborated with DHS and MDE on the parentaware.org website, which connects parents to a database of more than 12,000 programs. Search results feature programs with Parent Aware ratings, helping families easily identify those that are using research-based best practices in school readiness. The online search tool enables parents to search for programs by location, schedule, education quality and types of care. Additional features include a more user-friendly search function and improved information resources. This site had hosted over 105,000 visitors from over 4,000 different cities and towns throughout Minnesota in 2015.

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	53	10%	158	31%	193	38%	255	50%	560	91%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	23	10%	123	43%	169	59%	212	74%	258	90%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	68	58%	100	85%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	144	47%	174	57%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	23	58%	34	62%	46	66%	62	70%	158	92%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	203	5%	227	8%	685	16%	866	25%	1,212	35%
Other 1	110	0.1%	57	0.6%	565	6%	1,225	13%	1,884	20%
<i>Describe:</i>	Licensed centers and licensed family child care programs not receiving CCDF funds.									
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.										

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

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

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



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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	509	53	10%	509	138	27%	509	464	91%	618	548	89%	618	587	95%
<i>Specify:</i>	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	286	23	10%	286	229	80%	286	258	90%	286	257	90%	286	257	90%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	118	0	0%	118	0	0%	118	1	1%	118	8	7%	132	9	7%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	306	0	0%	306	0	0%	306	2	1%	306	29	9%	306	36	12%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	40	23	58%	54	37	69%	141	138	98%	171	158	92%		137	
Programs receiving CCDF funds	3,462	203	5%	3,462	112	3%	3,221	385	12%	3,135	531	17%	2,682	762	28%
Other 1	9,422	110	0.1%	9,422	59	0.1%	7,016	219	3%	8,235	660	8%	8,897	910	10%
<i>Describe:</i>	Licensed centers and licensed family child care programs not receiving CCDF funds.														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

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

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

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

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

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

**State-funded preschool:** The 2015 numbers are the number of School Readiness-funded school-based pre-K sites rated as of December 31st, 2015, as verified by both the Develop Database and the records at the Department of Education. In Minnesota, 79 additional school-based pre-K programs are rated that operate without state School Readiness funding, and seven rated charter school based pre-K programs. These programs are eligible for ratings if they are meeting School Readiness standards. These programs are not included in this count because they do not meet the state definition of "state-funded preschool" as defined in the grant application and in previous APRs.

**Head Start and Early Head Start:** The 2015 numbers are based on the number of Head Start/Early Head Start sites rated as of December 31, 2015, as verified by both the Develop Database at DHS and the records at the Department of Education.

**Programs funded under Title I of ESEA:** The 2015 numbers are based on the number of ELD sites in school districts identified through agency financial reporting systems as using Title I funds for Preschool in SFY2015, and that were also in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2015.

**Programs receiving from CCDF Funds:** The count of programs receiving CCDF funds were pulled from Minnesota's administrative data system (MEC2) for programs paid for service in the month of October 2015. Reporting October service data allows most provider bills to be submitted and paid by the time the counts are pulled for February reporting. The count represents the number of Minnesota and tribally licensed family and center based child care providers paid for caring for at least one child aged 0-5 and not yet in kindergarten. The count of programs participating in Parent Aware includes the subset of those programs that were rated in Parent Aware as of December 31, 2015.

**Other (Licensed child care centers and family child care providers not receiving CCDF funds):** There are 11,579 licensed child care programs in the state of Minnesota as of January 14, 2016. Of those, 2,682 receive CCDF funding and 8,897 do not. Of the 8,897 licensed child care programs that do not receive CCDF funds, 910 were rated in the TQRIS as of December 31, 2015.

### **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.

We are proud of our progress in increasing the number and percentage of ELD programs participating in the statewide TQRIS. The total number of rated programs has increased each year of statewide implementation from 2012 to 2015: 529, 1322, 1892 and 2434 programs were rated, respectively. Due to a lag in implementation in 2012, we have had less time than originally planned to achieve targets. Specifically, a six month delay in implementation at the onset of the grant resulted in one cohort instead of two in 2012. Targets assumed eight cohorts by 2015, however only seven have been completed.

Targets were met or exceeded for state-funded preschool, Early Head Start and Head Start and programs funded under Title 1 of ESEA. Targets were not reached for programs funded by IDEA, Part C, IDEA, Part B section 619, and programs receiving funding from CCDF funds and licensed centers

and licensed family child care not receiving CCDF funds.

One goal of the QRIS was to increase and recognize the quality in all early care and education settings so that children with special education needs can be included in high quality settings. We have seen statewide capacity increased. Although Part C and Part B IDEA programs have been included in the rating process since the fall of 2013, the spread of participation has been slow. While other early learning programs are incentivized by the prospect of receiving scholarship funds or quality improvement dollars, these incentives are not available for IDEA programs as these programs have always been provided to parents at no cost. The current structure of Parent Aware may not be the best fit for measuring the quality of Part C and Part B IDEA programs or incentivize their participation.

To ensure targets for programs receiving CCDF and other licensed child care programs are reached by the end of Minnesota's no cost extension, we will continue to support the work of the Parent Aware recruiters through the end of the extension. To date, we have reached 63 percent of our goal for programs receiving CCDF funds and 48 percent of our goal for other licensed child care. Our progress for programs receiving CCDF funding is a strong indication that we are targeting programs that will help us reach our goal of serving more children of high need in the higher TQRIS tiers. Additionally, we know that time is an important variable in increasing participation rates. There is a direct relationship between the number of years ELD programs in a county have access to Parent Aware and participation rates. The longer programs have access to Parent Aware, the higher the participation rates.

Targeted, effective communication combined with relationship-building is a central strategy to increase participation in TQRIS. Messages and marketing efforts targeted at these two types of providers are based on the Provider Perception Surveys conducted by Child Trends each year from 2013 to 2015. The survey results suggested that the primary reason for participation in the TQRIS for accredited child care, state-funded preschool and Head Start programs are Early Learning Scholarships. Non-accredited child care cite professionalism and professional development as a highly ranked factor in their decision to participate. These surveys are essential to crafting messages and designing approaches to motivate programs to join Parent Aware.

We continue to recruit IDEA programs through information sharing on our monthly leadership calls, and at our two face to face leadership forums in March and October. In addition, information on how to pursue a rating is shared with each Professional Development Facilitator PDF. Each facilitator is required to have at least quarterly contact with each ECSE leader in their assigned set of schools.

**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.

In 2015, Minnesota continued success from previous years, making significant progress in how we implement inter-rater reliability in the Parent Aware Rating process. Inter-rater reliability was built into the workflow features of Develop, the data system that administers Parent Aware ratings. This made the process more efficient, standardized and fair, and allowed for the establishment of inter-rater reliability for programs applying for an accelerated rating. We also developed training for raters based on the results of the reliability testing by examining areas of greatest challenge and creating clear guidelines for decision making.

In 2015, we continue to meet or exceed the 85 percent bench mark for inter-rater reliability in Parent Aware Ratings (95%) and CLASS observations (100%).



**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.

During this reporting year, the Minnesota Legislature increased funding for the state funded Early Learning Scholarships program by \$17 million. Additionally, 2015 marked the roll-out of Early Learning Scholarships statewide, aligning with the statewide expansion of Parent Aware. MDE also increased the award amount available for families choosing higher Parent Aware rated programs. Families choosing programs at the highest level of our TQRIS are eligible to receive up to \$7,500 to cover the cost of attending the program. Early learning scholarships can only be used at Parent Aware rated programs.

For progress on program and provider training to support program getting ready for or participating in Parent Aware, see progress described in the Early Childhood Education Workforce section.

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>					
<b>Targets</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS</b>	393	654	1,491	2,610	3,700
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	4	40	150	300	450
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	24	70	250	500	750
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	64	90	350	700	1,050
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	301	454	741	1,110	1,450
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>					
<b>Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated</b>					

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>					
<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS</b>	393	529	1,322	1,892	2,434
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	4	30	68	227	415
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	24	16	135	268	366
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	64	5	26	72	146
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	301	478	1,093	1,325	1,507
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>					
<b>Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated</b>					

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

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

Because Minnesota's TQRIS was rolled out over time, 2015 was the first year that all licensed child care programs were eligible to participate. In 2015, there were 12,907 ELD programs (sites) in the state that were eligible to participate in Minnesota's TQRIS. This total includes 9,874 licensed family child care providers, 1,705 licensed child care centers, 286 Head Start/Early Head Start sites, 118 districts funded by IDEA Part C, 306 districts funded by IDEA Part B, and 618 state-funded preschool sites. In addition, but not included in the total, the TQRIS is available to an unknown number of school-based preschool sites that are funded with alternative (non-state) funds, and an unknown number of tribally-licensed child care providers. Data on licensed child care providers comes from Minnesota's Licensing Lookup database as of January 14, 2016. The data sources for Head Start/Early Head Start sites, programs funded by IDEA Part C, programs funded by IDEA Part B, and state-funded preschool are explained in the notes to Table B2c.

The 2015 count of rated programs comes from Develop, Minnesota's Quality Improvement and Registry Tool, and includes all programs with an active rating as of December 31, 2015. The total number of Parent Aware rated programs as of December 31, 2015 was 2,434. In other words, Minnesota reached 66 percent of its target of 3,700 rated programs. While the distribution of ratings is not as predicted, participation is continuing to increase by a little over 500 programs per year.

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

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

We have exceeded the target for Tier 4 and nearly reached the target for Tier 1. To ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the targets for the number of programs in Tiers 2 and 3 we will continue to prioritize the recruitment of non-accredited programs (see B(2)(c) for strategies). Recruiters and coaches communicate messages to programs to come into the TQRIS wherever they are. Any rating is a step toward quality. We expect to see participation rates increase in Tiers 2 and 3 as more programs seek their second and third 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 Tier 3 and 4.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	2,857	12%	7,228	31%	8,860	38%	11,658	50%	25,189	96%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	3,397	24%	6,997	50%	8,797	62%	10,297	73%	11,890	95%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1,253	25%	2,507	50%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2,754	25%	4,958	45%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	1,182	53%	1,854	57%	2,579	61%	3,488	66%	4,690	71%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	4,049	20%	4,261	21%	4,870	24%	6,088	30%	8,117	40%
Other 1										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	23,317	2,857	12%	23,317	7,401	32%	26,108	21,489	82%	26,238	24,818	95%	27,886	26,748	96%
<i>Specify:</i>	School-based preschool programs funded by Minnesota's School Readiness Program														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	14,096	3,397	24%	14,096	11,163	79%	12,435	11,747	94%	12,435	11,743	94%	12,435	12,017	97%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	5,013	0	0%	5,027	0	0%	5,162	0	0%	5,449	386	7%	5,524	433	8%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	11,017	0	0%	11,102	0	0%	10,865	14	0%	11,076	967	9%	11,399	1,144	10%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	2,246	1,182	53%	3,252	1,812	56%	4,989	4,936	99%	10,956	10,150	93%	6,457	5,900	91%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	20,292	4,049	20%	20,292	2,395	12%	18,152	5,150	28%	17,233	5,261	31%	16,504	6,001	36%
Other 1															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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



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

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

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

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

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

**For state-funded preschool:** The total number of Children with High Needs served comes from the Minnesota Department of Education's School Readiness Annual Report 2014-2015 and only includes those children receiving more than 30 hours of service/involvement. The number of children who are served in programs/sites who are rated by Parent Aware as of December 31, 2015 uses the same pool of children but includes only those that were served in programs/sites that were rated by Parent Aware as of December 31, 2015. Since state-funded preschool programs are only eligible for Four-Star ratings, all rated programs are in the top tiers. In Minnesota, there are additional school-based pre-K programs operating without School Readiness funding. These programs are eligible for ratings if they are meeting School Readiness standards. We rated 86 such programs (sites) in 2015. We are not including children served in those programs in this count because we do not have data on whether those children meet the definition of Children with High Needs.

**For Early Head Start and Head Start:** The total number of Children with High Needs served comes from data pulled from the Minnesota Head Start Funded Enrollment report for SFY2015 as reported to the Minnesota Department of Education by programs receiving Head Start funds. The count includes only children served in the following settings: center-based, combination sites, family child care, and child care centers. It does not include home-based settings. Since Head Start programs are only eligible for Four-Star ratings, all rated programs are in the top tiers.

**For programs funded under Title I of ESEA:** The total number of children served per Title I program in SFY2016 was collected from school districts via the same voluntary survey used in previous years. The response rate to the survey was lower than in previous years and all respondents were Parent Aware rated. Due to the low response rate, it is likely that these numbers are under reported.

**For programs receiving CCDF funds:** The count of children receiving CCDF funds were pulled from Minnesota's administrative data system (MEC2) for the children receiving service in month of October 2015. Reporting October service data allows most provider bills to be submitted and paid by the time the counts are pulled for February reporting. The count represents the number of children aged 0-5 and not yet in Kindergarten, on whose behalf CCDF funds were paid to licensed child care programs that were rated in the top tiers of the TQRIS as of December 31, 2015.

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

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

Over 700 more children that receive CCDF funds were enrolled in ELD programs in the top tiers of TQRIS in 2015 than last year. While progress has been made each year, we reached 74 percent of the target for 2015. We will continue to prioritize programs that receive CCDF funds in TQRIS recruitment activities.

All children participating in IDEA-funded programs (Part C and Part B) are children with disabilities. As a result, as additional programs become rated, the numbers of high needs children participating in top tiers will increase. As a part of the assurances on the Parent Aware application for ECSE programs, they agree to share information about the Parent Aware Rating process with local early care and education programs and include those partners in their curriculum and training opportunities. MDE and DHS continue to work collaboratively on resources for early care and education providers to assist in

the differentiation of typical and atypical development, how to make a referral and what to expect after a referral is made.

**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.

Minnesota's plan to validate the effectiveness of the TQRIS focuses on four goals:

Goal 1: The evaluation will examine the effectiveness of indicators by evaluating the methods used to determine when a quality indicator has been met, the patterns of indicators met by programs, and the experience of programs in meeting those indicators.

Goal 2: The evaluation will examine how well the hybrid rating structure is differentiating quality by comparing star ratings to quality as determined by both the CLASS and the Environmental Rating Scales and by examining which indicators at each level are most challenging for providers.

Goal 3: The evaluation will examine the linkages between star ratings and children's progress toward school readiness by analyzing the relationship between a child's gains over the course of a school year and the quality rating of the program in which the child was served.

Goal 4: The evaluation will examine the effectiveness of quality improvement supports and the extent to which the TQRIS rating scale can detect changes in quality over time.

In 2015, Minnesota made progress in Goals 1, 2 and 3. As part of Goal 1, Minnesota engaged in an indicator review process, examining the strength of the research basis underpinning each TQRIS indicator and gathering research to inform potential revisions.

Related to Goals 2 and 3, Minnesota's external evaluator, Child Trends, released their final Parent Aware Validation Report in February 2016. The study collected data on the observed quality of programs (using the ECERS-R, FCCERS-R, CLASS, and ECERS-E) and also collected assessments from children in the fall and spring of their pre-kindergarten year (using the TOPEL, IGDIs, Woodcock Johnson Applied Problems, Peg Tap, Preschool Learning Behavior Scales, Body Mass Index, Social Competence and Behavior Evaluation 30, and the Bracken School Readiness Composite). The validation study shows that programs with higher ratings score better on some measures of observed quality than do lower-rated programs. Similarly, children served in higher-rated programs show greater growth on some measures of child development than do children served in lower-rated programs. Minnesota will include additional detail on the findings from the validation study in the final RTT-ELC report. Minnesota also looks forward to reading and learning from the validation reports for other Round One RTT states.

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

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

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

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

## Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

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

The Early Childhood Indicators of Progress (ECIP) are Minnesota's early learning standards. The standards help us share developmentally appropriate expectations for what children should know and be able to do at certain ages. In 2015, Minnesota began work on updating the science and math standards, each with a separate committee. Both committees should complete their work by spring 2016. Minnesota completed a revision of language, literacy, and communication, and social and emotional development in 2014. The remaining domains, creativity and the arts, approaches to learning, social systems and physical development will be completed during Minnesota's no-cost extension.

In 2015, Minnesota used the same review process as in the first round of revisions for the ECIP. The process for reviewing the ECIP thoroughly gathered feedback from stakeholders. The process involved a committee for each reviewed domain (science and math). Committee members were recruited from across the state and included participants from across early childhood professions and sectors, including higher education. National, state and culturally specific reviewers were involved at different stages. Public input was solicited through meetings in different parts of the state, as well as a feedback mechanism provided on MDE's website.

Prior to RTT-ELC the ECIP included two documents, one for infants and toddlers and one for preschool. In response to committee feedback, Minnesota recruited experts in learning and development across age ranges to help combine the ECIP to one document. The result includes indicators in multiple age bands so that the continuum of learning and development is clear.

To promote the use of the new ECIP, Minnesota is contracting with the Center for Early Education and Development at the University of Minnesota to develop training for trainers. This training is designed to help trainers embed the standards in all the training they are already doing.

As part of an effort to encourage use of the standards, a series of briefs on the use of the standards was defined in 2015 and the contract for the development and writing will be available in early 2016. The training on the ECIP will be completed in 2016. In addition in 2015, the state began work on the development of a new standards search tool, which will allow teachers to filter the standards by domain, age range(s), component(s) and subcomponent(s).

## 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.

In 2015, Minnesota continued to make considerable progress on the early childhood comprehensive assessment system, including implementation of multiple online resources, supports for training and coaching and expansion of the system in grades K-3.

First, Minnesota completed a draft of uniform review criteria by which all early learning assessments for the kindergarten entry assessment, early childhood special education (ECSE) and comprehensive assessments will be examined in the future. Components of this review include evidence of each tool's validity and reliability as well as design elements and accommodations for specific populations.

Second, Minnesota completed building an online tool finder to assist early learning programs with choosing an appropriate assessment tool. This finder is designed to match respondents with assessments based on their responses to an online algorithm. The tool finder currently includes all Parent Aware approved tools and kindergarten entry assessments. You can find the tool on the MDE [website](#). Plans to expand the tool finder to include ECSE evaluation tools will continue through June 2016.

MDE, in partnership with the University of Minnesota, completed work on a series of hybrid learning modules that focus on authentic assessment for special topics. Early learning programs can access in-depth face-to-face training or view online overview of content across the following topic areas: (1) primer on authentic assessment, (2) embedding authentic assessment into everyday practice, (3) involving families in the assessment process, (4) assessment, standards and curricula, (5) support for administrators, (6) using assessment to inform instruction and (7) assessment for special populations. You can find the online modules on the University of Minnesota's [website](#).

In order to ensure the information captured in the online modules is translated into K-3 friendly terms, Minnesota is reproducing four of the above mentioned modules for K-3 audiences. These online resources will be completed by December 2016.

Additional trainers were trained as part of the comprehensive assessment system in 2015, increasing the number of certified assessment trainers to over 50. The last round of train-the-trainer courses were for the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) in which the Minnesota trained three additional pre-K CLASS trainers who are housed in greater Minnesota and one new K-3 CLASS trainer.

MDE continues to maximize its partnerships by teaming with the DHS and Head Start Regional T/TA network to host practice based coaching training and CLASS coach workshops with the outcome to have increased capacity for support on the tool by the end of 2016. While tools-specific coaching is important, Minnesota recognized that not all programs can afford a coach and therefore commissioned the creation of a relationship-based professional development (RBPD) protocol which programs can use to implement RBPD in their programs at no cost for external staff.

Electronic Screening Initiative: Minnesota has experienced many successes and challenges during the first six months of actively piloting electronic access to the Ages & Stages Questionnaires, Third Edition (ASQ-3) and Ages & Stages Questionnaires: Social-Emotional (ASQ:SE) screening instruments.

Six of the eleven community-level pilot sites have fully implemented electronic screening access for the families they serve in settings such as family home visiting, WIC clinics, early childhood screening, primary care clinics and Early Head Start/Head Start. These sites have succeeded in establishing new screening procedures to assure families and the staff have the time, training and comfort level to use the electronic system. All sites have experienced an immediate increase in the number of children screened using the electronic system. A high percentage of families reported that the electronic system is extremely easy or easy to use and that it helped them to understand and support their child's growth and development. Two pilot sites have used the Somali audio versions of the ASQ-3 and the ASQ:SE with families with minor success and have identified sections that need to be re-recorded or translated.

The remaining pilot sites are in various stages of implementation, but continue to struggle with unanticipated technical challenges. Many of the local agencies did not have the IT resources and/or capacity of local IT staff involvement to assure that the electronic screening system could be installed onto an existing server and individual computers. The process of identifying each agency's IT protocol was time intensive and overwhelming. Two of the sites are also developing an additional data interface between the electronic screening system and a local agency data tracking system to avoid duplicate entry. Full implementation for the remaining pilot sites is expected by early March 2016.

Each of the active screening sites are provided a monthly data report that includes run charts with cumulative monthly screening totals, as well as family satisfaction percentages. All pilot sites are required to submit quality improvement methods on a monthly basis and are provided ongoing technical assistance and support. Minnesota has also contracted with a quality improvement advisor to provide joint learning opportunities and individual technical guidance to the pilot sites as they review goals and plan for quality improvement measurement strategies.

Electronic screening efforts continue to be aligned with other state-led early identification initiatives, including Minnesota's Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (ECCS) grant and Minnesota's implementation of the National Help Me Grow system. Pilot activities will continue through Minnesota's no-cost extension.



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

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

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

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

Not applicable - Minnesota did not pursue.

MINNESOTA DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREAS C(3) OR C(4) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION  
PAGES 38 of 100 THROUGH 40 of 100 HAVE BEEN DELETED

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

(Section D(1) of Application)

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

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

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

The Knowledge and Competency Framework (released in December 2014) includes three versions:

- Pre-school children in center and school programs.
- Infants and toddlers.
- Children in family child care home settings.

The Framework combines what an early care and education provider needs to know about research and theory, with the skills and abilities needed to work effectively in the field. The Framework:

- Articulates knowledge and skills needed in the early childhood field.
- Aligns with the Board of Teaching Standards and shows a progression of skill development at three levels: *Explores*, *Implements*, and *Designs and Leads*, with each level building on the competencies of the level before it.
- Facilitates pathways for learning.
- Assists early care and education providers in planning for continued professional growth.

The competencies address eight broad content areas:

- Child Development and Learning.
- Developmentally Appropriate Learning Experiences.
- Assessment, Evaluation and Individualization.
- Relationships with Families.
- Health, Safety and Nutrition.

- Historical and Contemporary Development of Early Childhood Education.
- Professionalism.
- Application Through Clinical Experience.

Companion guides to accompany the Family Child Care and Preschool versions were completed in 2015 and posted on the MDE website. They are based on the previously developed Infant and Toddler Companion Guide created in 2010, by the Center for Early Education and Development. These are written in “plain language” and include strategies and examples.

Progress is being made toward Minnesota's goal of general acceptance of the KCF by early childhood community and faculty of institutions of higher education.

In 2015, Minnesota's Association for Early Childhood Teacher Educators endorsed the use of the KCF in their coursework. To assist IHEs in deeply and meaningfully embedding the KCF in coursework, a RFP was published in the fall of 2015. The grant will support three pairs of two and four year programs as they work to integrate the KCF, identify the few and powerful competencies and ensure scaffolding of learning for students if they move from one program to another. Grant contracts have been executed and work will begin in early 2016. Grantees are expected to share lessons learned about the process used and assessments of competence.

Relationships are also being developed with secondary teachers of Family and Consumer Science classes. They are currently developing a teacher cadet program and are interested in using the KCF as a basis for study.

In partnership with these efforts, DHS worked in 2015 to align training and supports for the early childhood community. By July 1, 2016, all courses in Develop, Minnesota's online Quality Improvement & Registry Tool, will be categorized according to the content areas outlined in the Knowledge and Competency Framework. As part of Minnesota's no-cost extension, the Individual Training Needs Assessment (ITNA) self-assessment will be revised to align with the framework to help early care and education providers plan their professional development.

Additionally, DHS developed Knowledge and Competency Framework training for both trainers and early care and education providers in 2015. Both trainings are approved by the Minnesota Center for Professional Development (MNCPD) and listed in Develop.

By the end of Minnesota's no-cost extension, the Knowledge and Competency Framework for early care and education providers will be delivered through the Child Care Aware child care resource and referral training delivery system. The Knowledge and Competency Framework training for Trainers will be offered by Child Care Aware of Minnesota - Coordinating Office.

**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.

Minnesota is dedicated to improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with children with high needs. Minnesota has two key strategies to support Early Childhood Educator development and advancement. First, Minnesota is developing new or revise existing credentials and training. Secondly, Minnesota is providing increased supports to educators to access training and education aligned with Minnesota's Knowledge and Competency Framework and Parent Aware. All efforts will continue through the end of the grant period with support of Minnesota's no-cost extension.

In 2015, Minnesota made progress in developing new or revising existing credentials and training in the following ways:

The Minnesota Child Care Credential (MNCCC) continues to be offered via a cohort model in English, Spanish and Somali languages. This training meets all of the Parent Aware training indicator

requirements in addition to the 120-hour training requirement for the National Council's Child Development Associate Credential. The MNCCC training modules are aligned with our new Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Development of the Minnesota Infant/Toddler Credential (MNITC) was completed and English and Spanish cohorts are scheduled to begin in early spring 2016. The Department of Human Services Child Welfare Unit has also contracted with one of the original MNITC curriculum writers to revise some content so the credential addresses the specific professional education needs of foster care parents caring for infants and toddlers. This will result in a separate 20 hour credential which aligns with the 30-hour MNITC developed for child care providers in both home and center-based settings.

Minnesota provided increased supports to educators to access training and education in the following ways:

A training on the new Knowledge and Competency Framework for trainers and early childhood providers was developed and will be released in 2016.

An additional 108 hours (representing 20 new courses) was developed to meet Parent Aware training indicators. The content of these trainings reflect level 2 and level 3 of the Knowledge and Competency Framework, offering more in-depth and rigorous training for child care providers seeking non-credit training.

Coaches, consultants and trainers with expertise in developmental disabilities, special health care needs and behavioral disorders provided services to child care providers participating in Parent Aware who have children with special needs in their care.

Professional Development Advisors continued to work with child care programs participating in Parent Aware needing technical assistance in ensuring the training they have taken or will be taking meet the Parent Aware training indicators.

Parent Aware Quality Coaches and CLASS Coaches provided coaching and/or technical assistance to programs participating in Parent Aware.

Bilingual/bicultural trainer capacity was increased through trainer learning communities to thirty trainers representing eight language communities participated in 2015. Professional development opportunities such as one-on-one mentoring were offered to newly approved trainers from diverse communities.

Qualifications and approval processes were identified for Inclusion Coaches, Accreditation Coaches, MLFCCA Quality Coaches and Business Consultants in Develop, Minnesota's Quality Improvement and Registry Tool. In 2016, child care providers who access this approved coaching can meet specific licensing training hours and Parent Aware training requirements.

One hundred eighteen early childhood professionals were awarded REETAIN grants that recognize educational attainment and years of service in the field.

One hundred two students were awarded TEACH grants to help cover the costs of tuition and books for pursuit of early childhood related degrees.

In 2016, Minnesota will continue to make progress to provide increased supports to access training and education by:

- Continuing to provide low cost training to providers that meets training indicators required for

Parent Aware.

- Continuing to provide scholarships for training associated with the attainment of the Child Development Associate Credential.
- Continuing the TEACH scholarship program for early childhood educators pursuing higher education.
- Delivery of courses associated with the new Minnesota Infant Toddler Credential.
- Training bilingual and bi-cultural trainers on licensing preservice training so newly licensed bilingual providers can receive the training in their home language.
- Continue to deliver training content to trainers and providers on the new Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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

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

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

<b>Baseline and Annual Targets</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers</b>	16	25	35	45	51
<b>Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider</b>	471	555	809	883	954

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

<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers</b>	16	16	16	50	50
<b>Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider</b>	471	555	726	947	1,136

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

Previous year totals show 16 aligned institutions - MNCPD, MNAEYC, National Council for Professional Recognition, and 13 Technical/Community Colleges. Now that the Knowledge and Competency Framework has been aligned with the Board of Teaching standards, we can conclude that any institution or provider that uses the Board of Teaching standards is aligned with the Knowledge and Competency Framework. While all Institutes of Higher Education are expected to align their coursework with the Board of Teaching standards, we are aware that this may not be happening consistently. A survey of institutes of higher education showed that 94 percent of the 50 higher education institutions reported using the Board of Teaching standards to develop learning objectives for their courses. There are 27 two-year institutions and 23 four-year institutions currently offering degrees or credentials in early childhood care and education. Thus, we estimate that 47 institutions of higher education (and three professional development providers) are offering coursework that is aligned with the Knowledge and Competency Framework. These 47 institutes of higher education along with the three professional development providers above provides a total of 50 institutes and



providers aligned to the Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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

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

In 2015, Minnesota's work to implement the revised Knowledge and Competency Framework resulted in Minnesota meeting or very nearly meeting all our targets. Strategies for implementation include the following:

- Consultation with institutions of higher education on the content in the new Framework, its alignment with the Board of Teaching standards and ways the Framework can be used for curriculum development.
- Provide grant opportunity for two- and four-year Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) to deeply and meaningfully embed the Knowledge and Competency Framework into coursework. The grant asks that a two-year IHE pair with a four-year to examine how they will scaffold learning for a student transferring from one institution to another. These partnerships could potentially lead to articulation agreements.
- Development of training on the new Framework for trainers and practitioners.
- Alignment of the new Framework with our Professional Development Registry and Minnesota' Career Lattice.
- Promotion of the new Framework to early childhood practitioners, trainers, and institutions of higher education.

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.</b>										
<b>Baseline and Annual Targets</b>										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Credential Type 1</b>	27		93		140		140		140	
<i>Specify:</i>	Minnesota Child Care Credential									
<b>Credential Type 2</b>	26		14		15		20		25	
<i>Specify:</i>	MNAEYC Director's Credential									
<b>Credential Type 3</b>	180		193		206		221		300	
<i>Specify:</i>	National Child Development Associate (CDA)									
<b>Credential Type 4</b>	81		87		93		100		150	
<i>Specify:</i>	Certificate or Diploma in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.070									
<b>Credential Type 5</b>	157		168		180		192		275	
<i>Specify:</i>	Associate Degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708									
<b>Credential Type 6</b>	0		0		175		210		240	
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelor degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708, 13									
<b>Credential Type 7</b>	4,013		4,214		4,424		4,646		4,878	
<i>Specify:</i>	Teacher licenses of staff working in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), School Re									
<b>Credential Type 8</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 9</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 10</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 11</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 12</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 13</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										

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

**Actuals**

Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Credential Type 1</b>	27		73		62		0		97	
<i>Specify:</i>	Minnesota Child Care Credential									
<b>Credential Type 2</b>	26		6		11		13		22	
<i>Specify:</i>	MNAEYC Director's Credential									
<b>Credential Type 3</b>	180		223		351		357		398	
<i>Specify:</i>	National Child Development Associate (CDA)									
<b>Credential Type 4</b>	81		94		108		195		202	
<i>Specify:</i>	Certificate or Diploma in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708									
<b>Credential Type 5</b>	157		159		194		275		298	
<i>Specify:</i>	Associate Degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708									
<b>Credential Type 6</b>	0		0		0		107		119	
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelor degree in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0706, 19.0709, 19.0708, 13									
<b>Credential Type 7</b>	4,013		4,487		6,013		5,954		6,956	
<i>Specify:</i>	Teacher licenses of staff working in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), School Rea									
<b>Credential Type 8</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 9</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 10</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 11</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 12</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 13</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										

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

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

Percentages are left blank because Minnesota does not have an accurate count of the number of early childhood educators in the state. The 2011 Child Care Workforce Study estimates the size of the workforce in Minnesota at 31,000 (including all family child care providers and all directors, teachers, assistant teachers, and aides working in non-school-age child care centers). This number does not include Head Start staff and may not fully reflect those working in school-based pre-K programs.

**Cumulative Numbers vs Yearly Gains:** To achieve consistency and clarity, Minnesota reports only on Yearly Gains rather than on the total number of early childhood educators in the state that hold the credential.

**Notes on Credential Type 1:** Data comes from Develop, Minnesota's Quality Improvement and Registry Tool. The Minnesota Child Care Credential is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Notes on Credential Type 2:** Data comes from MnAEOYC administrative records. The MnAEOYC Director's Credential is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Notes on Credential Type 3:** Data on CDAs (first-time awards, not renewals) awarded to Minnesota practitioners comes from the National Council for Professional Recognition. The Child Development Associate is aligned with Minnesota's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Notes on Credential Type 4, 5, and 6:** Data on certificates and diplomas earned at Minnesota institutions was pulled from the 2013-14 IPEDS Completion Survey Data. Minnesota counts certificates, diplomas, and degrees in any of the following CIP codes: 13.1209 (Kindergarten/Preschool Education and Teaching), 13.1210 (Early Childhood Education and Teaching), 13.1015 (Early Childhood Special Education Programs), 19.0706 (Child Development), 19.0709 (Child Care Provider/Assistant), 19.0708 (Child Care and Support Services Management). To determine which institutions offer degrees and credential that are aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, a survey was administered to Institutes of Higher Education that offer such degrees and credentials. Because the response rate to the survey was low, we are unable to say with certainty which Institutes of Higher Education are aligned. Because the survey found that 94 percent of higher education institutions reported using the Board of Teaching standards to develop learning objectives for their courses, we estimated that 94 percent of degrees and credential awarded are awarded by institutions that are aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

**Notes on Credential Type 7:** Data was pulled from STAR (Minnesota Department of Education's data system for teacher licensure and employment) and captures the Count of Active 2013-2014 Licensed Staff for License Codes 180150 (formerly 180102), 190500, and 180401 (formerly 180402).

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

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

Continued progress through the end of the grant period is supported through Minnesota's no-cost extension and include the following strategies:

Minnesota Child Care Credential - Content for the Minnesota Child Care Credential was revised in 2014. Delivery of the new content began in summer 2014. Students complete the credential in a cohort model and completion takes between nine-13 months depending on delivery method. We had a large interest in the revised credential which accounted for the significant increase in completion rates in 2015 compared to previous years. In 2016, we are continuing to offer credential classes statewide, subsidizing 90 percent of the costs through our RTT-ELC dollars.

MNAEYC's Director Credential - Director's Credential classes are delivered online and in classroom settings in a cohort model. There are currently several cohorts underway and we expect continued participation throughout 2016.

Bachelor Degrees - The TEACH Early Childhood Scholarship program continued to see an increase in awards in 2015. We have broadened eligibility criteria so scholarships are now available to administrators, trainers, and coaches as well as classroom staff. Contracts are awarded to students annually. As most students are taking courses part time there is some turnaround time required before we see completion of degrees. However, we do anticipate the increased scholarship numbers to result in an increase in Bachelor degrees in 2016 and beyond.

## Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

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

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

The Minnesota Kindergarten Entry Profile (KEP) is designed as a tool to measure children's status on the Early Childhood Indicators of Progress (ECIP) beginning at kindergarten entry. In order to do this, the menu of tools from which districts can choose has undergone a substantial amount of rigorous alignment and validity testing, paying close attention to the domain coverage of the standards. The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) completed its two-phase pilot of the KEP process in 2015 and has adopted the following tools:

- Desired Results Developmental Profile - Kindergarten.
- Formative Assessment System for Teachers.
- Teaching Strategies Gold.
- Work Sampling System - Minnesota Adapted Version.

All tools are completed within the first eight weeks of the kindergarten year and data collection is centered on the administration guidelines to ensure fidelity to the administration. Each tool has empirical as well as theoretical alignment to the ECIP documented in crosswalks between the tools and standards, confirmatory factor analysis and item level analysis. All data gathered as part of the KEP is used in order to support the measurement of standards in the classroom.

Considerable attention is paid to each tool's evidence of validity and reliability in the KEP pilot. As referenced above, the KEP process was completed in two phases: (1) validity of each tool's alignment

to the ECIP and (2) concurrent calibration of tools to ensure alignment to one another. MDE hosted two national and two state webinars to highlight the study's results and provide information on replicating this process to other states who are interested in adopting a menu of tools from which programs can choose.

The goal of the KEP revision was to create a more flexible system by which to measure children's status on meeting age expectations at the beginning of kindergarten. This is accomplished by allowing districts to choose from a menu of acceptable tools that meet the needs of their student populations as well as district and school assessment culture. There are two latent functions of this approach; first, if given a choice of tools and an incentive to use them (i.e. professional development and assistance with accountability reporting) districts will be more likely to opt into the voluntary study. The second function of this approach is that MDE will be able to aggregate data from multiple tools and publicly report children's status according to the early learning standards. This reporting mechanism ensures the state is not beholden to one specific tool for statewide implementation and reports on what children should know and be able to do, not simply a score on a test.

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.

The implementation of the KEP in 2015 remained on a smaller scale to ensure MDE collected enough data to complete the replication of the pilot for the Formative Assessment System for Teachers. Schools and districts were invited to participate in the voluntary study. The KEP was implemented in 157 classrooms across 25 school districts in Minnesota. Schools and districts who opted in to the study chose an instrument based on their district or school needs. MDE provided professional development or technical assistance to help in the decision-making when it was requested. All teachers who participated in the KEP were trained on their chosen tool in late August of 2015.

The state successfully completed all goals outlined in Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge in 2015. This included completion of phase 2 pilots, implementation of the revised KEP in fall 2015, identifying funding needs and requesting appropriate funding and planning for statewide implementation. MDE used specific strategies to ensure successful completion of the RTT-ELC goals. The first strategy focused on clearer communication of the purpose of the KEP and expansion of the stakeholder audience to include advocacy organizations, school boards and K-12 education cooperatives. The second strategy was to create efficiencies within the process to ensure districts and teachers could implement the KEP and use the data for multiple purposes, including mandatory reporting for other statewide initiatives.

The Minnesota KEP continues to be a voluntary program in which districts and schools can opt to participate. This is due to the limited amount of annual funding provided in state general funds (\$281,000). MDE estimates a full statewide implementation using the menu of tools would be \$1.7M per year. MDE staff are using the efficiencies created in the pilot to increase the sample size from the historic 10% voluntary sample to a 20% voluntary sample and focus efforts on professional development and marketing in 2016. In future years, MDE will continue to increase the sample size depending on legislative funding increases.

As Minnesota continues to implement the KEP, MDE will continue to explore strategies that yield exceptional gains in both participation and sustainability. For example, in 2016 MDE adopted a rolling enrollment option by which districts can opt into the KEP and be trained on the tool up to nine months prior to implementation. The option for rolling enrollment allows districts more time to decide on a tool that may work for their student populations and teacher preference. Recruitment for the 2016 study began in January 2016 and will continue through August 2016. Districts are also signing up to participate in the 2017 data collection in 2016. This allows time for teachers to be trained on the tool



and practice implementing the measure prior to collecting data for the KEP. This strategy is intended to ease the stress on teachers.

Additional efforts to improve the implementation of the KEP include tracking effective communication strategies, tailoring training dates to coincide with district professional development dates and partnering with regional trainers to ensure access to high-quality training in greater Minnesota.

## 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.

Minnesota's Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System (ECLDS) site was released in early 2016. The analytics offered at this release will generally describe the participation in a variety of early care and education programs for a kindergarten cohort of children. Analytics work beginning in late winter 2016 will be focused on examining the longer-term status of children in relation to their early care experiences. A second data load later in 2016 will add another cohort to the first, building a second group of children for whom status can be examined over time. The remaining months of the Race to the Top grant period will allow for these additional contributions to the site, additional data sources, and enhancements and improvements identified during the first months after the launch.

We faced challenges similar to many states with a late start to our work, delays in hiring initial teams, and relationship-building between departments as we navigated the construction of data sharing agreements and governance structures. We addressed timing challenges by engaging in sound project planning principles and practices. Specifically, our technical and program/business project plans were anchored around shared milestones and we adhered to a strict calendar for each necessary step in our process. In addition, the technical project manager and the program/business manager were in close communication throughout the grant period, meeting every other week for planning. This was absolutely essential to stay on track and recover time lost initially due to late start. In terms of relationship-building, we feel we have cultivated functional relationships to support our work. This has required persistence and regular check-ins about our goals and the obligations to our grant. Establishing commitment to the end product was key to maintaining forward momentum.

Given our next steps involve site launch and enhancements to the site, we will monitor our progress by building multiple feedback mechanisms for visitors to the site. This will include a support email inbox, a pop-up feature to the site inquiring about specific uses (supported by the SLDS-IES grant), and additional remote focus groups with out-state stakeholders to introduce them to the site as needed. Information from all of these mechanisms will inform our work to enhance and improve the site as we also add new data sources and analytics between now and December 2016.

## Data Tables

### Commitment to early learning and development.

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

<b>Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income<sup>1</sup> families, by age</b>		
	<b>Number of children from Low-Income families in the State</b>	<b>Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State</b>
<b>Infants under age 1</b>	24,151	34.9%
<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	47,947	35.6%
<b>Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry</b>	77,955	36.1%
<b>Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families</b>	150,053	35.7%

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

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

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

ACS Data from previous year was used to estimate current year. ACS Public Use Microdata Sample DataSet(s) used: 2014 (accessed through Data Ferrett). Universe: ((AGEP in (00)) or (AGEP between 01 and 05)) AND ((ST=27)). Weight used: PWGTP. POVPIP Income to poverty ratio recoded.

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

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

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays <sup>1</sup>	16,129	4%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	39,725	10%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	2,622	0%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>		
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	6,970	1.7%
Are in foster care	3,287	0%
Other 1 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

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

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

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

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

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

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

English Language Learners estimated based on MARSS enrollment for kindergartners served through English Language Learner services from SFY14.

Children who reside on "Indian Lands" are from the American Community Survey Table S0101 Age and Sex, 2010-14.

Migrant data for children birth to five is not available.

No change in the homeless count from last year at the time of this report.

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

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

<b>Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>			27,358	27,358
<i>Specify:</i>	ELS Annual Reports and Early Education Student SFY2015.			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	2,129		12,321	14,450
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	SFY2015 Approved Enrollment Chart. Toddler counts included in infants.			
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	662	4,842	11,322	16,826
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	12/1/15 OSEP reporting.			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	0	31	5,869	5,900
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Program Survey 2015.			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	1,735	6,211	9,454	17,400
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	SFY2015 monthly average children served based on payments issued during SFY2015.			
<b>Other 1</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 2</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 3</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 4</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 5</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 6</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

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

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

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

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

**For programs funded under Title I of ESEA:** Program survey is still in progress (current numbers reflect children being served by rated Title I programs that are also receiving Title I PreK Incentive funds).

**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	2,115	821	1,692	2,462	60	274	19,971
<i>Specify:</i>	ELS Annual Reports and Early Education Student, SFY15						
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	3,759	1,570	829	4,200	67	1,330	8,228
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	475	170	227	465	5	253	3,909
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,140	257	524	985	14	543	7,859
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	1,061	296	388	7,708	12	1,201	6,038
Other 1							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 2							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.							

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

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

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

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

Early Head Start and Head Start data is pulled from the 2014-15 Program Information Report.

SFY2015 monthly average children served based on payments issued during SFY2015 with annual unduplicated age data applied to restrict to age 0-5 (and not yet in K), annual unduplicated race data for all ages applied. **Race data is unknown for 713 children served in SF20Y15.**

Source: Administrative data from the eligibility and payment system, MEC2. Counts of children in care with a program receiving CCDF funds is restricted to children participating in the Child Care Assistance Program, the program through which Minnesota administers the CCDF subsidy program. Minnesota does not have access to counts of all children in care with these programs.



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

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

Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
<b>Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000	\$20,100,000
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$9,792,000	\$9,958,393	\$10,095,000	\$11,962,000	\$12,170,000
<i>Specify:</i>	School Readiness Program				
<b>State contributions to IDEA Part C</b>	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979	\$30,163,979
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry</b>	\$124,568,148	\$124,568,148	\$124,568,148	\$124,568,148	\$124,568,148
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$80,990,440	\$93,987,000	\$82,426,900	\$98,051,468	\$132,459,026
<b>State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met</b>	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>	\$52,710,490	\$64,402,563	\$53,008,044	\$68,579,217	\$102,457,899
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>	\$55,041,000	\$44,083,000	\$62,086,000	\$48,099,000	\$48,451,000
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>	\$426,456				
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Child Mental Health Infrastructure Grant				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	\$21,177,000	\$22,636,263	\$22,797,000	\$26,651,000	\$27,512,000
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Family Education				
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>	\$3,434,000	\$3,513,640	\$3,330,000	\$3,330,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Screening				
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>	\$8,451,503	\$8,557,000	\$8,557,000	\$8,557,000	\$8,557,000
<i>Specify:</i>	TANF expenditures on Home Visiting				
<b>Other State contributions 5</b>	0	\$402,500	\$552,786	\$1,000,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Private Funding: Marketing of Parent Aware (Parent Aware for School Readiness)				
<b>Other State contributions 6</b>	0	\$400,509	\$420,337	\$25,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Private Funding: TQIRS Evaluation (Parent Aware for School Readiness/Greater Twin Cities Unif				

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

**Funding for each Fiscal Year**

<b>Type of investment</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Other State contributions 7</b>	0	\$713,970	\$751,630	\$529,865	
<i>Specify:</i>	Private Funding: Quality Improvement (Greater Twin Cities United Way)				
<b>Other State contributions 8</b>	0	\$540,000	\$4,125,000	\$5,125,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Private Funding: Minnesota Reading Corps				
<b>Total State contributions:</b>	<b>\$354,144,526</b>	<b>\$359,624,402</b>	<b>\$366,517,780</b>	<b>\$378,162,460</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b> <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	24,790	24,736	26,108	26,238	27,358
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Learning Services Annual Reports SFY15				
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	14,085	14,988	14,220	14,672	14,450
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	16,162	16,129	16,027	16,500	16,923
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b> <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report )</i>	2,246	3,252	4,651	4,651	
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> <i>(average monthly served)</i>	20,292	19,691	18,566	17,639	17,400
<b>Other 1</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 2</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 3</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 4</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 5</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 6</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 7</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 8</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					

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

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

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

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

<sup>3</sup> Counts of children in care with a program receiving CCDF funds is restricted to children participating in the Child Care Assistance Program, the program through which Minnesota administers the CCDF subsidy program. Minnesota does not have access to counts of all children in care with these programs.

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

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

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Screening Measures**

Programs receiving CCDF funds are required to have training which includes awareness about screening.

The current Quality Rating and Improvement System requires that all programs must provide parents with information on screening - Tier 1 and above.

State-funded preschool requires all children to receive early childhood screening within the first 90 days of attendance.

**Formative Assessments**

For programs receiving CCDF funds, Minnesota licensing regulations for child care centers (not family child care) require that a child's intellectual, physical, and social and emotional development be reported during parent conferences. There is no reference to formative assessment.

For the current Quality Rating and Improvement system, Tier 1, all FC providers and lead teachers have at least two hours training on authentic observation. Tier 2 requires that families are given summary of child's observation records. Tiers 3 and 4 - assessments are conducted using an approved tool at least twice per year in at least the following domains: social-emotional, language and literacy, mathematical thinking and physical development; all lead teachers/providers must complete eight hours of training on authentic child assessment, OR

Conducts assessment using an approved tool with all children at least once per year in two or more domains, and all lead teachers/providers have completed at least 8 hours of training on authentic child assessment.

(If program is using an approved assessment tool with some but not all age groups, partial credit is given.)

Provides families with child assessment results, and if a child has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), OR

Individual Family Services Plan (IFSP), shares assessment results with team with family's permission. For a child with a special need who is receiving specialty services (for example, physical or

occupational therapy), shares assessment results with service providers with family's permission.

Minnesota licensing regulations for child care centers (not family child care) require that a child's intellectual, physical, social and emotional development be reported during parent conferences. There is no reference to formative assessment.

State-funded preschools require that each child's cognitive skills be assessed with a comprehensive child assessment instrument upon entry and before the child leaves the program.

### **Measures of Environmental Quality**

Those programs funded under IDEA Part B, section 619 that were selected to participate in Minnesota's implementation of the Pyramid Model continue to scale-up using Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (T-POT).

For programs receiving CCDF funds and participating in the current Parent Aware QRIS in Tier 2 must complete an environment self-assessment based on the Environment Rating Scales (ITERS/ECERS/FCCERS) and develop goals for areas where improvement is needed.

State-funded preschools, at this point in time, do not require an assessment of the teaching-classroom environment.

### **Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions**

Those programs funded under IDEA Part B, section 619 that were selected to participate in Minnesota's implementation of the Pyramid Model continue to scale-up using Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool.

For programs receiving CCDF funds and participating in the current Quality Rating and Improvement System, fully-rated centers only: all preschool and preschool/toddler classrooms must receive a CLASS score of two or higher in the Instructional Support category of the CLASS to achieve Tier 3, and 2.5 or higher to achieve Tier 4. Fully-rated centers also receive points for their CLASS scores that help them achieve Tier 3 or higher.



## 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.

Minnesota's expenditures for calendar year 2015 are the highest expenditures to date. Minnesota exceeded budgets for grants to organizations, other and indirect but under spent slightly on salary, fringe, travel, supplies and contracts.

### Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

Minnesota has submitted plans for no-cost extensions with detailed budgets and at this point there are no expected substantive changes.

## **Project Budget 1**

**Project Name: Parent Aware, Minnesota's TQRIS**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

The lower expenditures than budgeted for the Parent Aware Project remain reflective of two primary factors: (1) There is a lag in project contractor expenditures at the end of the grant reporting year because of Department of Human Services practice to award most contracts on a state fiscal year basis (July 1 - June 30). More specifically, the 2015 calendar year expenditures do not reflect state fiscal year second quarter expenditures. These will be reflected as expended in early 2016 by DHS with a subsequent request to MDE for reimbursement. (2) Lower than anticipated participation of child care programs in Parent Aware resulted in some underspending of contractor funds for processing of ratings, quality improvement supports and for on-site observations.

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

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

As described in the no-cost extension for Project 1 for the final year, Minnesota intends to continue project activities to recruit targeted programs, increase market penetration of Parent Aware to child care programs, continue and expand marketing to families, and ensure on-going validity and reliability of Parent Aware for six additional months (through June 30, 2016) and complete remaining activities to revise Parent Aware indicator revision and enhancements to Develop, the Parent Aware data system by December 31, 2016.

## **Project Budget 2**

**Project Name:** Early Learning Scholarships

---

### **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 expenditures for the Early Learning Scholarships are slightly ahead of schedule with the bulk of RTT-ELC scholarship recipients either aging out of the program and moving on to kindergarten or transitioning on to the new state funding.

### **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.

During the no-cost extension period of our grant, Minnesota will continue to transition remaining RTT-ELC funded scholarship recipients onto state funds as they become age eligible for the state funds. In the last 12 months, Minnesota will continue to build the state infrastructure to maintain the Early Learning Scholarship program and ensure the program works seamlessly in the statewide early childhood system. No substantive changes are foreseen at this time.

## **Project Budget 3**

**Project Name:** Title I PreK Incentives

---

### **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 expenditures for the Title I PreK Incentives are also slightly ahead of schedule with the bulk of RTT-ELC funds being in grants to school districts to support early childhood programming with Title I and RTT-ELC funding.

### **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.

During the no-cost extension period of our grant, school districts will continue to provide early childhood programming to high risk young children in Minnesota through Title I and RTT-ELC funds. Additional P-3 professional development will continued to be offered to school districts and community partners in order to ensure the current and future workforce is well trained in high quality P-3 framework and implementation. No substantive changes are foreseen at this time.

## **Project Budget 4**

**Project Name:** 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.

The expenditures for the Standards project are also slightly ahead of schedule with the revision of four domains complete and an additional two domains left to revised during Minnesota's no-cost extension.

### **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.

During the no-cost extension, Minnesota also be developing additional resources for teachers and families to easily access Minnesota's Early Learning Standards. A majority of this work will be done through contracts. No substantive changes are foreseen at this time.

## **Project Budget 5**

**Project Name: Comprehensive Assessment 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.

The expenditures for the Comprehensive Assessment System were close to being on schedule with a vacant position half way through the year leaving salaries, fringe and indirect just slightly lower than budgeted.

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

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

The Comprehensive Assessment System will continue to ramp up the training of trainers on additional assessments including CLASS and FAST in order to support sustainability of available training on assessments for early childhood providers and ensure quality assessment practices throughout the state. Additionally, the online needs assessment will be expanded to include assessments for Early Childhood Special Education outcomes as well as additional tiered training modules on assessments for early childhood providers at all levels. No substantive changes are foreseen at this time.

## Project Budget 6

**Project Name: Workforce Framework**

---

### 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 expenditures for the Workforce Framework project were close to the budget with salaries, fringe and indirect just slightly lower than budgeted.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Minnesota will be using its no-cost extension to work with Institutes of Higher Education on incorporating the Knowledge and Competency Framework in 2 year and 4 year coursework for early childhood professionals. No substantive changes are foreseen at this time.

## **Project Budget 7**

**Project Name: Great Workforce Supports**

---

### **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 lower expenditures than budgeted for the Great Workforce Supports Project are reflective of several factors: (1) There is a lag in project contractor expenditures at the end of the grant reporting year because of Department of Human Services practice to award most contracts on a state fiscal year basis (July 1 - June 30). More specifically, the 2015 calendar year expenditures do not reflect state fiscal year second quarter expenditures. These will be reflected as expended in early 2016 by DHS with a subsequent request to MDE for reimbursement. (2) Lower than anticipated participation of child care programs in Parent Aware resulted in some underspending of contractor funds for low cost training needed for Parent Aware. (3) A delay in work and underspending on the part of contractor tasked with developing new training.

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

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

As described in the no-cost extension for Project 7 for the final year, Minnesota intends to continue the following project activities through June 30, 2016: support a trainer learning community for bilingual trainers; provide coaching and training to child care programs serving children with special needs, deliver Minnesota Child Care Credential training and TEACH scholarships, maintain registry capacity through the Minnesota Center for Professional Development and complete a final Great Workforce Annual Report. In addition, continued delivery of Parent Aware training modules and completion of new advanced Parent Aware training will take place through December 31, 2016.



## **Project Budget 8**

**Project Name:** Kindergarten Entrance Assessment

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

The expenditures for the Kindergarten Entrance Assessment were higher than budgeted due to additional analysis and work on implementing Minnesota's new menu of assessments called the Kindergarten Entrance Profile.

### **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.

During the no-cost extension, Minnesota will be continuing to implement the Kindergarten Entrance Profile and look to scale it up with remaining funds. No substantive changes are foreseen at this time.

## **Project Budget 9**

**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.

The expenditures for the Early Childhood Longitudinal Data system were just slightly above budgeted due to the additional efforts Minnesota put into launching the system right after the new year.

### **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.

Minnesota will continue to work on additional analytical reports for the brand new ECLDS during the no-cost extension period as well as look to add two or more data sets to the system. No substantive changes are foreseen at this time.

## **Project Budget 10**

**Project Name:** Family, Friend and Neighbor

---

### **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 expenditures for the Family, Friend and Neighbor project were slightly lower than budgeted due to some invoicing that came in after the new year.

### **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.

The Family, Friend and Neighbor project will not be continued in the no-cost extension period and will not have additional RTT-ELC funded activities in the coming year.

## **Project Budget 11**

**Project Name: Public Private Partnership**

---

### **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 lower expenditures than budgeted for the Public Private Partnership Project are due to a lag in project contractor expenditures at the end of the grant reporting year because of Department of Human Services practice to award most contracts on a state fiscal year basis (July 1 - June 30). More specifically, the 2015 calendar year expenditures do not reflect state fiscal year second quarter expenditures. These will be reflected as expended in early 2016 by DHS with a subsequent request to MDE for reimbursement.

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

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

As described in the no-cost extension for Project 11 for the final year, Minnesota intends to continue activities with the vendor, First Children's Finance, through June 30, 2016, thus completing all the work required under this project.

## **Project Budget 12**

**Project Name: Project Management**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

The expenditures for the Project Management of the grant were just slightly above budgeted across all expenditure lines. This is in part due to additional work needed to prepare the no-costs extension requests and grantees choosing to expend grant funds by the end of the year instead of extending for the additional year.

### **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.

The expenditures for Project Management during the no-cost extension will be used to continue to manage and provide support to the remaining projects extending for the additional year. No substantive changes are foreseen at this time.

**Project Budget 13**

**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 MINNESOTA RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 12 PROJECTS.  
PAGES 84-100 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	\$208,273.86	\$851,646.81	\$1,117,986.65	\$1,042,735.97	\$3,220,643.29
2. Fringe Benefits	\$58,715.06	\$238,109.29	\$297,905.81	\$262,243.15	\$856,973.31
3. Travel	\$1,640.00	\$8,023.90	\$8,220.51	\$8,657.81	\$26,542.22
4. Equipment	\$879.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$879.00
5. Supplies	\$1,113.13	\$22,433.50	\$17,906.13	\$21,723.97	\$63,176.73
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$1,579,302.25	\$3,439,374.19	\$5,206,779.05	\$10,225,455.49
7. Training Stipends	\$1,083.00	\$1,359.00	\$0.00	\$525.00	\$2,967.00
8. Other	\$10,544.34	\$52,242.00	\$79,490.73	\$112,113.59	\$254,390.66
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$282,248.39	\$2,753,116.75	\$4,960,884.02	\$6,654,778.54	\$14,651,027.70
10. Indirect Costs*	\$55,954.37	\$366,898.12	\$504,268.83	\$532,052.52	\$1,459,173.84
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$317,763.00	\$3,371,731.94	\$5,941,675.88	\$5,086,717.02	\$14,717,887.84
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$18,259.31	\$38,006.00	\$109,963.84	\$98,762.38	\$264,991.53
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$674,225.07	\$6,529,752.81	\$11,516,792.57	\$12,372,310.46	\$31,093,080.91
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$13,665,854.00	\$15,631,024.00	\$13,606,703.51	\$13,393,159.38	\$56,296,740.89
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$14,340,079.07	\$22,160,776.81	\$25,123,496.08	\$25,765,469.84	\$87,389,821.80

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 - Parent Aware**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$29,216.00	\$251,075.00	\$434,072.26	\$341,453.54	\$1,055,816.80
2. Fringe Benefits	\$6,039.00	\$59,518.00	\$99,045.84	\$99,372.38	\$263,975.22
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$2,210.00	\$3,268.61	\$7,153.12	\$12,631.73
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$18,669.00	\$10,960.98	\$10,825.00	\$40,454.98
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$277,694.00	\$1,413,472.64	\$2,130,450.31	\$3,821,616.95
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$525.00	\$525.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$524.00	\$9,289.52	\$15,714.40	\$25,527.92
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$35,255.00	\$609,690.00	\$1,970,109.85	\$2,605,493.75	\$5,220,548.60
10. Indirect Costs*	\$8,391.00	\$92,431.00	\$151,814.73	\$145,250.27	\$397,887.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$8,807.00	\$61,113.72	\$38,136.33	\$108,057.05
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$43,646.00	\$710,928.00	\$2,183,038.30	\$2,788,880.35	\$5,726,492.65
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$4,369,924.00	\$4,631,862.00	\$4,054,865.00	\$4,150,000.00	\$17,206,651.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$4,413,570.00	\$5,342,790.00	\$6,237,903.30	\$6,938,880.35	\$22,933,143.65

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



**Actual Expenditures for Project 2 - SR Scholarships**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$31,585.00	\$57,415.00	\$35,212.25	\$52,383.77	\$176,596.02
2. Fringe Benefits	\$7,166.00	\$17,940.00	\$14,769.33	\$16,222.67	\$56,098.00
3. Travel	\$358.00	\$689.00	\$35.39	\$71.58	\$1,153.97
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$791.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$791.00
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	\$2,903.00	\$7,031.00	\$5,358.43	\$6,496.89	\$21,789.32
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$42,012.00	\$83,866.00	\$55,375.40	\$75,174.91	\$256,428.31
10. Indirect Costs*	\$8,193.00	\$17,990.00	\$11,518.07	\$15,116.33	\$52,817.40
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$269,669.00	\$2,752,053.00	\$4,347,686.40	\$2,780,169.19	\$10,149,577.59
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$319,874.00	\$2,853,909.00	\$4,414,579.87	\$2,870,460.43	\$10,458,823.30
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$470,000.00	\$470,000.00	\$470,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,410,000.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$789,874.00	\$3,323,909.00	\$4,884,579.87	\$2,870,460.43	\$11,868,823.30

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 - Title 1 Prek**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$9,342.00	\$60,260.00	\$27,166.63	\$69,491.56	\$166,260.19
2. Fringe Benefits	\$1,780.00	\$12,439.00	\$16,750.90	\$15,363.92	\$46,333.82
3. Travel	\$644.00	\$1,383.41	\$110.00	\$362.58	\$2,499.99
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$70.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$70.06
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$181,931.25	\$207,500.79	\$364,936.87	\$754,368.91
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00
8. Other	\$527.00	\$5,115.00	\$9,552.67	\$11,086.46	\$26,281.13
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$12,363.06	\$262,328.66	\$261,080.99	\$461,241.39	\$997,014.10
10. Indirect Costs*	\$2,178.00	\$27,594.00	\$16,344.66	\$24,328.27	\$70,444.93
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$48,094.00	\$610,871.94	\$1,268,632.51	\$1,709,394.32	\$3,636,992.77
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$62,635.06	\$900,794.60	\$1,546,058.16	\$2,194,963.98	\$4,704,451.80
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$48,094.00	\$2,162,316.00	\$1,268,632.51	\$1,709,394.38	\$5,188,436.89
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$110,729.06	\$3,063,110.60	\$2,814,690.67	\$3,904,358.36	\$9,892,888.69

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Standards

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	\$28.00	\$28.00
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	\$12,680.00	\$50,070.62	\$62,824.84	\$125,575.46
7. Training Stipends	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$41.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$41.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,000.00	\$12,721.00	\$50,070.62	\$62,852.84	\$126,644.46
10. Indirect Costs*	\$208.00	\$2,538.00	\$6,814.52	\$2,784.61	\$12,345.13
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$1,208.00	\$15,259.00	\$56,885.14	\$65,637.45	\$138,989.59
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$374,630.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$374,630.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$375,838.00	\$15,259.00	\$56,885.14	\$65,637.45	\$513,619.59

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 - Comp Assessment Sys**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$16,327.00	\$74,565.00	\$75,881.66	\$59,347.66	\$226,121.32
2. Fringe Benefits	\$3,858.00	\$21,555.00	\$22,515.12	\$16,052.98	\$63,981.10
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,170.00	\$95.04	\$274.73	\$1,539.77
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$43.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,074.81	\$5,117.81
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$61,506.00	\$127,350.26	\$393,966.68	\$582,822.94
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$551.00	\$8,223.00	\$11,146.88	\$7,563.04	\$27,483.92
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$20,779.00	\$167,019.00	\$236,988.96	\$482,279.90	\$907,066.86
10. Indirect Costs*	\$3,453.00	\$32,801.00	\$34,543.12	\$42,282.53	\$113,079.65
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$24,232.00	\$199,820.00	\$271,532.08	\$524,562.43	\$1,020,146.51
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$4,728,206.00	\$4,641,846.00	\$4,728,206.00	\$4,498,765.00	\$18,597,023.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$4,752,438.00	\$4,841,666.00	\$4,999,738.08	\$5,023,327.43	\$19,617,169.51

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 - Workforce Framework**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$22,402.00	\$28,920.98	\$32,707.13	\$84,030.11
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$4,740.00	\$6,181.55	\$6,977.66	\$17,899.21
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$420.51	\$0.00	\$420.51
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	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$1,598.00	\$3,448.64	\$3,353.57	\$8,400.21
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$28,740.00	\$43,971.68	\$43,038.36	\$115,750.04
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$5,978.00	\$9,146.13	\$8,493.00	\$23,617.13
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$34,718.00	\$53,117.81	\$51,531.36	\$139,367.17
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$200,000.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$50,000.00	\$84,718.00	\$103,117.81	\$101,531.36	\$339,367.17

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 - Workforce Support**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,798.79	\$8,848.00	\$20,646.79
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,652.21	\$1,908.28	\$4,560.49
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$42.33	\$0.00	\$42.33
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	\$832,786.00	\$1,138,309.41	\$1,421,434.73	\$3,392,530.14
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$827.17	\$1,074.86	\$1,902.03
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$832,786.00	\$1,153,629.91	\$1,433,265.87	\$3,419,681.78
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,186.69	\$2,458.54	\$5,645.23
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$832,786.00	\$1,156,816.60	\$1,435,724.41	\$3,425,327.01
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$3,195,000.00	\$3,195,000.00	\$2,655,000.00	\$2,655,000.00	\$11,700,000.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$3,195,000.00	\$4,027,786.00	\$3,811,816.60	\$4,090,724.41	\$15,125,327.01

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 - K Entry Assessment**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$12,871.00	\$24,562.35	\$23,441.75	\$60,875.10
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$3,107.00	\$5,418.05	\$4,867.41	\$13,392.46
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$41.00	\$77.52	\$0.00	\$118.52
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,318.20	\$0.00	\$4,318.20
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$87,023.67	\$13,800.00	\$100,823.67
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$1,333.00	\$4,295.45	\$3,003.52	\$8,631.97
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$17,352.00	\$125,695.24	\$45,112.68	\$188,159.92
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$3,552.00	\$20,098.04	\$9,028.11	\$32,678.15
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$20,904.00	\$145,793.28	\$54,140.79	\$220,838.07
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$281,000.00	\$281,000.00	\$281,000.00	\$281,000.00	\$1,124,000.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$281,000.00	\$301,904.00	\$426,793.28	\$335,140.79	\$1,344,838.07

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 9 - Early Learning Data System**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$66,474.86	\$284,705.81	\$326,402.26	\$294,263.21	\$971,846.14
2. Fringe Benefits	\$21,482.06	\$89,746.29	\$104,217.32	\$60,914.70	\$276,360.37
3. Travel	\$142.00	\$1,354.49	\$3,151.34	\$425.68	\$5,073.51
4. Equipment	\$879.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$879.00
5. Supplies	\$101.00	\$1,558.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,659.50
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$211,205.00	\$403,646.80	\$750,301.91	\$1,365,153.71
7. Training Stipends	\$83.00	\$159.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$242.00
8. Other	\$3,559.00	\$17,098.00	\$26,109.84	\$48,175.10	\$94,941.94
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$92,720.92	\$605,827.09	\$863,527.56	\$1,154,080.60	\$2,716,156.17
10. Indirect Costs*	\$17,729.37	\$155,676.66	\$209,255.34	\$230,474.41	\$613,135.78
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$177,187.94	\$441,818.20	\$619,006.14
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$110,450.29	\$761,503.75	\$1,249,970.84	\$1,826,373.21	\$3,948,298.09
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$100,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	\$300,000.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$210,450.29	\$911,503.75	\$1,299,970.84	\$1,826,373.21	\$4,248,298.09

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 10 - FFN**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$150.00	\$1,035.00	\$754.16	\$3,106.63	\$5,045.79
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$1,500.00	\$7,000.00	\$33,000.00	\$41,500.00
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)	\$150.00	\$2,535.00	\$7,754.16	\$36,106.63	\$46,545.79
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$558.46	\$1,612.86	\$6,916.18	\$9,087.50
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$150.00	\$3,093.46	\$9,367.02	\$43,022.81	\$55,633.29
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$49,000.00	\$49,000.00	\$49,000.00	\$49,000.00	\$196,000.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$49,150.00	\$52,093.46	\$58,367.02	\$92,022.81	\$251,633.29

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 11 - Public Private Partnerships**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$35,563.71	\$35,563.71
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$35,563.71	\$35,563.71
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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$35,563.71	\$35,563.71
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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$35,563.71	\$35,563.71

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 12 - Project Management**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$55,329.00	\$88,353.00	\$153,969.47	\$160,799.35	\$458,450.82
2. Fringe Benefits	\$18,390.00	\$29,064.00	\$26,355.49	\$40,563.15	\$114,372.64
3. Travel	\$496.00	\$1,176.00	\$1,019.77	\$342.12	\$3,033.89
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$749.07	\$380.00	\$1,872.79	\$2,717.53	\$5,719.39
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$3,004.34	\$11,279.00	\$9,462.13	\$15,645.75	\$39,391.22
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$77,968.41	\$130,252.00	\$192,679.65	\$220,567.90	\$621,467.96
10. Indirect Costs*	\$15,802.00	\$27,779.00	\$39,934.67	\$44,920.27	\$128,435.94
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$87,055.31	\$117,198.98	\$204,254.29
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$18,259.31	\$38,006.00	\$109,963.84	\$98,762.38	\$264,991.53
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$112,029.72	\$196,037.00	\$429,633.47	\$481,449.53	\$1,219,149.72
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$112,029.72	\$196,037.00	\$429,633.47	\$481,449.53	\$1,219,149.72

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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