

# Early Learning Challenge

## 2016 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



JUNE 2017





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

**Vermont**

---

2016

Due: February 28, 2017

U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20202  
OMB Number: 1810-0713  
Expiration Date: October 31, 2019

**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., 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#: S412A130038

2. Grantee Name Agency of Human Services, State of Vermont

3. Grantee Address 280 State Drive, Waterbury State Office Complex  
City: Waterbury  
State: Vermont Zip: 05671

4. Project Director Name: Julie Cadwallader Staub  
Title: Grant Director

Phone #: (802) 734-7540 Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax #: (802) 241-0100

Email: Julie.CadwalladerStaub@vermont.gov

### Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2016 To: 12/31/2016

### 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: 01/01/2016 To: 12/31/2016

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.

2016 marked a year of substantial progress for Vermont's Early Learning Challenge (ELC) grant, particularly at the systems level. Project implementation is also moving along well.

### 1. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#### *Building the Backbone of Vermont's Early Childhood system:*

2016 was a critical year for our Early Childhood State Advisory Council, **Building Bright Futures**, which receives significant grant funding. The executive director resigned in early January, and a talented and well-respected interim executive director stepped in. A lengthy search process ensued, which resulted in the hiring of a highly skilled executive for the position, Sarah Squirrell, in May. Sarah provides a strong and knowledgeable voice for children and families, and serves as a spokesperson for improved integration and coordination of early childhood systems, across agencies, to better support children and families. As a result, BBF has emerged as a well-respected, collaborative, unifying leader in the field of early childhood in Vermont. Importantly, she has built trust with state government agencies, legislators, philanthropy, and the non-profit sector, which bodes well for continuing sustainability post-grant.

There are several important areas in which BBF demonstrated its importance as the backbone organization for early childhood in 2016. Through the State Advisory Council, BBF embraced its role in driving policy, tackling the issue of opioid and substance use disorders and their impact on young children and families. BBF strengthened the feedback loop with the regions, and used their input effectively to drive policy issues. BBF demonstrated its commitment to the Early Childhood Action Plan --which pre-dates the grant, and will continue to guide early childhood efforts statewide post-grant --by strategically utilizing ELC grant Technical Assistance funding to hire a consultant to re-launch the Action Plan during the first half of 2017. The publication of *How Are Vermont's Young Children and Families* was timed to coincide with the opening of the legislative session, and the accompanying press conference included legislators, state agency leadership, leaders in the philanthropic sector as well as representatives from the nonprofit sector. BBF has been a critical partner in the implementation of other ELC projects such as Help Me Grow, Early Multi Tiered Systems of Support and Promise Communities, as each one of these projects depends upon local and regional implementation. BBF's public facing data portal, Vermont Insights, contributes to accountability of the early childhood system overall and enables Vermonters to access early childhood and related data easily through a single portal.

#### *Accountability:*

Speaking of accountability, there was major progress around building accountability into the early childhood system. In 2016, a formal structure called the **PreNatal - Grade 12 Data Governance Council** was adopted to vet, support, and analyze policy questions that cut across programs, agencies, and age spans. A "proof case" has been selected that will utilize data from Medicaid at the Agency of Human Services and PreK participation data from the Agency of Education.

Another major step was the continued implementation of the new kindergarten entry assessment (KEA). AOE issued its first report on **Ready for Kindergarten Survey (R4KIS)** in August of 2016, which provides a new, more accurate baseline for kindergarten readiness that will inform all efforts going forward. Unlike the old KEA, this survey uses a "total score approach" which links a student's score to overall ability. The new survey includes new and revised questions, and has six questions in the Physical Development and Health Domain. This was several years in the making, including a rigorous evaluation and two pilots, and represents a major systems-level milestone in early childhood. The FY17 report will be released spring 2017.

Along with the new R4KIS, the addition of the **Universal Developmental Screening (UDS) Registry** to the data collection and analysis at the Health Department contributes an important data element to tracking children's access to services and overall growth and development. Part of our Health Department immunization registry, the UDS Registry provides a statewide data collection system for developmental screening results. Screening results for multiple tools are included: The Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Third Edition (ASQ - 3), Ages and Stages Questionnaire-Social Emotional (ASQ:SE), and the Modified Checklist for Autism in Toddlers (M-CHAT).

The Registry screening collection system offers reporting features for primary care providers including: a screening history report, screening follow up status, children due for screening (per the American Academy of Pediatrics Bright Futures Periodicity schedule), and screening rates report. The intent is for primary care providers to use the registry features to help them improve developmental screening rates overall for children in their practice and to utilize the data to get credit for improved screening rates under the Vermont Blueprint for Health Care Reform. Four primary care practice sites have signed on to pilot the use of the Registry - and training is underway in the Lamoille region with Appleseed Pediatrics and Lamoille Valley early care and education professionals.

**PreK Monitoring** is another element in building a strong system of accountability in early childhood. Vermont's Early Learning Challenge grant supports the design of a monitoring system to address the requirements of Vermont's Act 166: Universal Pre-Kindergarten Education (PreK) for private and public PreK programs. 2016 was a very productive year, and the design of Vermont's PreK Monitoring System is well underway. The system will utilize cross agency (AOE and AHS) existing structures such as prequalification status for PreK under Act 166, child care licensing regulations, and Step Ahead Recognition System (STARS). The monitoring system is a joint agency responsibility between the Agency of Education and Agency of Human Services.

*Developmental Screening and Connecting Families to Services:*

**Help Me Grow Vermont (HMG VT)** improves access to existing resources and services for young children and families and promotes parent-engaged developmental monitoring and screening for all Vermont children. HMG VT has four system components: a centralized access point, family & community outreach, provider outreach and training, and data collection and analysis.

In partnership with Vermont Birth to Five, a project of the Permanent Fund for Vermont's Children, the Vermont Child Health Improvement Program (VCHIP) expanded developmental screening training from the health sector to early care and education (ECE) professionals across the state. In 2016, over 450 ECE professionals were trained in developmental screening and conducted over 1600 screens on children in their care.

The HMG VT centralized telephone access point at Vermont 2-1-1 received 666 (incoming) calls to the HMG VT Child Development Specialists who made 504 (outgoing/follow up) calls and 827 referrals on behalf of families. We served 226 children (unduplicated count) via telephone care coordination.

In Year 3, Vermont sustained progress made in increasing the number of children with high needs who receive developmental screenings, after a major jump in Year 2. With 15,317 children screened this year, we exceeded our Year 3 and 4 targets.

*Quality Improvement and Professional Development:*

After a major jump in Year One (2014) in the percentage of programs participating in **STARS**, Vermont's quality rating and improvement system for early learning and development programs - from 42% to 72% - Vermont has consistently maintained between 70 - 80% participation. In December 2016, 79% of all programs participated in STARS. The ability to sustain this increased participation over time bodes well for the quality of Vermont's early childhood system in the long term. We are also pleased to see a steady increase in the number of state-funded PreK programs, all of which participate in STARS at the highest levels of 4 and 5 stars, or three stars with an approved plan to achieve the four star level. We ended 2016 with 373 public and private programs prequalified to provide PreK under VT's Act 166. This is 55 more programs than there were at the same time last year! We continue to see a positive trend of more programs of all types with ratings in the top tiers of STARS. In 2016, we exceeded our Year 3 targets for the number of programs with 3 and 4 STARS.

2016 also saw a continuing increase in the number of **Specialized Child Care (SCC)** providers - those providers who care for children most at risk - participating in STARS, in part due to a new requirement that any new specialized child care provider have at least a 3 star rating. As of August 2016, 68% of SCC providers were at the 3 star level or higher, up from 54% in December of 2013! We expect to see this trend continue, as new state regulations require existing providers will also need to attain the 3, 4 or 5 star level in 2018.

In 2016, we witnessed a growing cohesion of efforts to **strengthen families**, as our projects that work directly with children and families embraced the common framework of the five protective factors for families. The five protective factors are part of Strengthening Families, a research-informed framework

that builds upon family strengths, enhances child development, and reduces the likelihood of child abuse and neglect. Vermont Birth to Five is leveraging ELC funds to build hub-and-spoke networks where home-based providers receive extensive training to build protective factors, make a strong connection to community resources, and connect families to needed supports and services. The project has been successful in enhancing provider engagement with families and the quality of care for children. It also provides concrete support for families in times of need.

Family child care providers participating in this project have reported an “increased ability to successfully advocate on behalf of enrolled families.” Many of these families have experienced food insecurity, medical emergencies, domestic abuse, mental health concerns, homelessness, substance abuse, parental incarceration, custody granted to other family members, and one participating child care provider cited the death of an enrolled child's parent. With 46% of enrolled children in the project qualifying for Child Care Financial Assistance (subsidy), any one of these family crises have the potential to place children at risk. The daily interactions between parents and their child care providers creates a powerful opportunity for a two generational approach for promoting family strengths to prevent the maltreatment of children. Some of these parents lack social supports and have come to rely on their child care provider. Family Resource Coaches, funded through this project, are used to navigate the isolated challenges families are experiencing. If a family has ongoing needs, they are connected to systems of support which may include home visiting. All families, not just those deemed “at risk”, benefit from being enrolled in these family child care programs that are implementing the Strengthening Families framework approach. At any point in time, a crisis can occur resulting in increased stress and instability which could potentially put children at risk for abuse and/or neglect. Through this project, family child care providers have learned the value of developing trusting relationships with all parents, as well as strategies to share community resources and flex funds when needed.

Highlights from 2016 include:

- 560 children from 413 families enrolled at participating family child care programs
- 31 (51%) participating programs are at the four or five star level, compared to 19 (29%) programs at the beginning of the project.
- 23 (42%) participating programs at 3 stars, compared to 20 (32%) at the beginning of the project.
- Families enrolled in participating programs received a total of \$54,929 for emergency needs including: alternative child care, groceries, electric bill, school clothes and supplies, car repair, lice treatment, diapers, stroller, special education equipment, rental deposit, winter clothing, car seat, heat after fuel assistance funds were exhausted/propane, wood, oil.

The five protective factors have also been incorporated into many other ELC projects, including Help Me Grow (HMG), which is running two pilots to promote use of the framework with primary care doctors and Child Development Specialists at the HMG contact center. Participants in our Promise Communities cohorts, including community members, early care and education representatives, principals, teachers, public health staff, parents, Agency of Human Services' field staff, Building Bright Futures staff, and more, receive training in the protective factors. The protective factors are incorporated into the STARS rating system and the two evidence-based Home Visiting models that are being implemented statewide.

In 2016 we worked to disseminate the new **Vermont Early Learning Standards (VELS)** throughout our early childhood system. A major highlight of 2016 was the VELS Institute, which took place June 20-24, 2016 at Champlain College. Through presentations, connections with other colleagues, conversations, and reflection, over 200 participants left better prepared to use the VELS to:

- Support the continuum of learning and development from birth through third grade;
- Support each young child, with emphasis on children who are culturally, linguistically, and individually diverse;

- Build inclusive programs and practices;
- Help families discover a tool to support their child's learning and development; and
- Encourage and support family engagement.

The VELs are posted on the Agency of Education website and can be accessed online at <http://education.vermont.gov/early-education/early-learning-standards>. More progress will be made during 2017 to complete this interactive web platform. VELs' "The Right Stuff" was designed and fully implemented beginning Fall 2016. The Right Stuff is an ongoing monthly VELs resource-sharing newsletter that reaches over 400 early childhood educators and leaders across Vermont. "The Right Stuff" highlights one domain of the VELs each month and is located for your review at <http://fpg.unc.edu/presentations/right-stuff>.

The work of the **Early Childhood Higher Ed Consortium** is another example of integration and collaboration. Act 166 and the new State Child Care regulations fueled increasing interest in, and need for, coursework in higher education to meet requirements for licensure; this resulted in a sense of urgency among IHEs and other providers of professional development to provide needed coursework and training, particularly for those in the private sector. Collaborating around the shared goal of better supporting the early childhood workforce to meet these new requirements, the Consortium developed an Early Childhood Summit for the summer of 2017, to provide ten simultaneous classes, offered by ten different Vermont institutions, through Castleton University's Center for Schools. The courses are designed to promote Vermont's core values for early education and to meet the needs of teachers from the AA to the MA level. A strong emphasis is placed on courses that assist teachers in obtaining or retaining licenses and endorsements. All of the courses adhere to a set of guidelines that include VELs, the protective factors and the guiding principles of meeting the needs of each and every child.

Execution and Implementation:

The Implementation Team of the Early Learning Challenge grant has continued to function effectively. It fosters collaboration and trust by bringing leaders of relevant state agencies together to discuss significant issues of implementation, coordination and problem-solving at the systems-level. Working together on the No Cost Extension application has been an important element of our discussions during 2016, as we conceptualize the fifth year application as a "launching pad" for sustainability for the system as a whole. As a result, we have carefully reviewed project implementation, integration across projects, data, and potential for sustainability. As was the case in 2015, the infrastructure for managing the Early Learning Challenge grant continued to function effectively. The State Advisory Committee, the Implementation Team, and the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Team supported implementation of ELC's projects throughout the state and across agencies. The continued smooth functioning of these structures helps to increase coordination between agencies and expedite implementation of projects across agencies, which strengthen the early childhood system overall.

**2. LESSONS LEARNED**

Based on lessons learned from the evaluation of the first cohort, the state **Promise Communities** team decided to re-design the Promise Communities model for the seven communities participating in cohort 2, which launched in 2016. We received federal approval for the re-design in April, 2016. We moved from a coaching model, in which coaches were assigned to specific communities, to a technical assistance model. Under the new model, selected communities are expected to identify their own leadership and backbone support.

Beginning with the second cohort, we required intensive training for local teams as part of their participation in the Promise Community initiative. The first of three intensive trainings for cohort two took place in October 2016 and focused on the primary frameworks we encourage all communities to use: Collective Impact, Strengthening Families, Appreciative Inquiry, and Results Based Accountability. Beyond the three intensive training weekends, Technical Assistance (TA) is offered to each community with supportive phone calls once a month and written feedback given to the TA team once a month.

While we wait for results, initial indications are encouraging, and the evaluation firm continues to work with our team in a process evaluation. With their expertise, we respond to the needs of the communities and adjust our work to support the communities as best we can. They will also be working in the communities to develop evaluation plans of their own community-based strategies.



### 3. CHALLENGES

Qualified PreK Teachers: Mandatory implementation at Act 166, Vermont's Universal PreK law, began in the fall of 2016. The success of Act 166, relies, in large part, on having enough qualified programs delivering PreK services in a variety of settings to serve all of Vermont's 3, 4, and 5 year olds not yet in kindergarten. Many high-quality programs are interested in providing Pre-K, but don't qualify because they don't employ a licensed early education teacher.

In the spring of 2016, the ad hoc PreK Teacher Capacity Work Group distributed an informal survey to all 3, 4 and 5 STAR programs, to ask both school and community-based child care providers whether they experience difficulty finding appropriately licensed teachers. The informal survey went out to 620 three, four, and five STAR programs. 212 center and home-based programs and 70 school-based programs responded, a 45% response rate. Key takeaways from the results include:

- **Recruiting and hiring licensed Pre-K Teachers is challenging, especially for home and center-based programs:**
  - Of 244 programs who responded to the question “Please rate the level of difficulty in recruiting or hiring a licensed Pre-K Teacher,” 191, or 78%, found the process “difficult” or “very difficult”.
- **Not being able to provide adequate wages and benefits poses the biggest hiring challenge for home and center-based programs:** 114 programs responded to a question asking about specific challenges faced in recruiting and hiring licensed Pre-K teachers:
  - 76 home and center-based programs reported not being able to pay the desired salary of a licensed teacher; 32 reported not being able to find a qualified teacher interested in working in their program.

AOE Staffing Challenges: Though in 2015 and part of 2016, several positions in early education at Agency of Education were unfilled, almost all key positions were filled by the end of 2016.

Delay in creation of the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS): Because of major delays in completion of the K-12 SLDS, the AOE has not been able to begin integration of early childhood datasets into the SLDS. However, a summit meeting between the vendor and the AOE resulted in a new timeline and a much higher level of commitment and understanding of the project with the vendor. New leadership at the vendor made this possible. As a result, AOE has a high level of confidence that the K-12 SLDS will be completed by June 30, 2017, and that the integration of early childhood datasets will commence at that time.

Delay in CIS data system: Delays have also slowed the development of the CIS data system, though progress was made in 2016. The base product that we are building the CIS system on does not currently have the ability to have more than one case/care manager on a case, but in CIS we have multiple providers who need to enter in goals and outcomes, summaries of evaluations, and case notes. Currently the vendor is in the process of conducting a “proof of concept” so that we can see if they can build this into the current system and meet our needs.

Spending Delay: Our Desk Monitoring Report of November 1, 2016 noted that Vermont was substantially behind in its spending plan, stating that almost \$24M out of the \$36.9M remained unspent at the end of Year Three. See “Strategies” below for our response.

### 4. STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES

Qualified PreK Teachers: Vermont's early childhood community continues to work on the systemic issues of wage and benefit disparity for early childhood providers. In the meantime, several statewide efforts and resources help address short-term challenges related to availability of licensed Pre-K Teachers:

The VT Agency of Education <http://education.vermont.gov/> and the Vermont Association for the Education of Young Children <http://vaeyc.org/quality-improvement/teach/> partnered to create a process for approximately 40 individuals (over two years) to be awarded provisional licensure, and are providing mentoring and financial support in order to help those individuals attain a VT Level 1 teaching license with ECE or ECSE endorsement. As of December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016, 5 have achieved ECE licensure and are continuing to work in community-based

programs, 2 have submitted peer review portfolios and are awaiting review, and 10 are on track to submit portfolios by January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017. We anticipate a similar number completing this process during 2017.

Dr. Eden Haywood-Bird, assistant professor in early elementary education at Lyndon State College, developed a new Early Childhood Education Licensure program that helps move those with an associate's degree to a bachelor's degree with licensure, and those with a bachelor's degree to licensure. This program is mostly online, so it greatly increases access for early childhood professionals throughout the state. In addition, the requirement for student teaching can be met in the place of employment, with approved supervision. For more information, visit: <http://lyndonstate.edu/degree-programs/education/early-childhood-education/>

The Vermont Standards Board has undertaken several efforts in the last few years that may be helpful to those seeking licensure with an ECE or ECSE endorsement:

- o Signed the Interstate NASDTEC “license to license” agreement which means that any educator with a non-conditional/non-expired out of state educator license, from a state that has also signed the agreement, is eligible for initial licensure in VT to match the same/equivalent endorsement from the other state.
- o Revised the competencies required to become licensed with ECE or ECSE endorsement. The new competencies were developed with significant guidance from the NAEYC teaching standards and others. These are the standards that will now be used for transcript review and peer review, which should significantly streamline the process.
- o Scheduled all 2017 Peer Review clinics on Saturdays.

AOE Staffing Challenges: Only one grant-related position remains open at this time, the grants administrator position at the Agency of Education, and the person who filled that position in the past has indicated an interest in resuming her work there part-time in 2017.

Delay in creation of the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS): As mentioned above, the AOE has a high degree of confidence that the SLDS will be completed by July 1, 2017.

Delay in CIS data system: The Deputy Commissioner of the Child Development Division and the Director of CIS continue to monitor this closely.

Spending Delay: In 2016, we completed an expedited spending plan to address the slow pace of spending, particularly in four project areas. We will submit quarterly reports to our federal partners to gauge our progress, compared to the expedited spending plan. The first quarter of the expedited spending plan was the last quarter of 2016, and we were close to being on target for the increased spending that we proposed. In addition to an expedited spending plan, we are planning on applying for a No Cost Extension year. At the present time, six projects will end as of December 2017; ten projects will need an extension of time, with no additional funding, for 2018; and eight projects will request an extension of time in addition to utilizing unspent remaining funds from other projects.

## **COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES**

Competitive Priority #4: Sustaining Program Effects into the Early Elementary Grades: Our project to sustain the effectiveness of early childhood programs into early elementary years continues through our implementation of FirstSchool, an initiative of the Frank Porter Graham Center of UNC, Chapel Hill. FirstSchool is a PreK-3rd grade initiative to promote public school efforts to become more responsive to the needs of an increasingly younger, more diverse population of children entering school. With the support of the Early Learning Challenge grant, Vermont supports six Pre-K through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade school communities, crossing Vermont from east to west, volunteered to participate in the FirstSchool pilot project: Smilie Elementary School, St. Albans City School, St. Johnsbury Elementary, and Tunbridge/Chelsea/Orange. Throughout the pilot project, FirstSchool is providing two and a half years of extensive professional development (e.g., weeklong summer institute, bi-monthly onsite coaching) to the administrators and educators in the Pre-K through 3rd Grade learning communities. One site, St. Albans City School, is also an Early MTSS site.

For 2016, AOE staff agreed that, instead of providing a four-day summer institute, FirstSchool should facilitate a two-day summer institute for leadership teams from all the school communities to attend jointly, and then one

day of targeted professional development at each school, along with classroom observation and coaching visits.

FirstSchool involves the use of EduSnap data. EduSnap is a 42 item time sampling observation instrument that describes children's experiences throughout the school day within activity settings (e.g., whole group, small group, transitions), learning content (e.g., reading, science, math), and teaching approaches (e.g., didactic, scaffolded instruction). The Snapshot is collected during naturalistic observation of classrooms throughout an entire school day to drive decision-making about teaching practices at the classroom, grade, and school levels. Baseline data was collected in 2015. Unfortunately, we were unable to collect data in the fall and winter of 2016 due to lack of interest in the temporary positions for EduSnap data collectors. We are working to address this issue and look forward to tracking progress of these children and teachers in 2017 as the pilot draws to a close.

Competitive Priority 24: Addressing the Needs of Children in Rural Areas: In 2016, Vermont's seven communities in the first Promise Communities cohort made significant progress in identifying innovative and transformative strategies to address the needs of local children and families. These strategies include home visiting programs, parenting programs, family events, and housing efforts. Some communities are also looking at the training needs of professionals in the community in areas including the Strengthening Families framework and trauma informed care. Communities began submitting their proposals, and requests for accompanying grant funds, for review at the state level in December of 2016. All proposals are expected to be submitted by spring 2017.

Based on lessons learned from the evaluation of the first cohort, the state Promise Communities team decided to re-design the Promise Communities model for the seven communities participating in cohort 2, which launched in 2016. We received federal approval for the re-design in April, 2016. We moved from a coaching model, in which coaches were assigned to specific communities, to a technical assistance model. Under the new model, selected communities are expected to identify their own leadership and backbone support.

Beginning with the second cohort, we required intensive training for local teams as part of their participation in the Promise Community initiative. The first of three intensive trainings for cohort two took place in October 2016 and focused on the primary frameworks we encourage all communities to use: Collective Impact, Strengthening Families, Appreciative Inquiry, and Results Based Accountability. Beyond the three intensive training weekends, Technical Assistance (TA) is offered to each community with supportive phone calls once a month and written feedback given to the TA team once a month.

Though the success of this new model remains to be seen, initial indications are encouraging, and the evaluation firm continues to work with our team in a process evaluation. With their expertise, we respond to the needs of the communities and adjust our work to support the communities as best we can. They will also be working in the communities to develop evaluation plans of their own community-based strategies.

Recruitment for cohort three will begin in January 2017. This will be the final cohort, and our hope is to have 10 communities participating, for a total of 24 Promise Communities over the course of the initiative.

## Successful State Systems

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

#### Governance Structure

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

The Governance structure of Vermont's Early Learning Challenge Grant consists of several components, unchanged from prior years:

The Early Learning Challenge - Race to the Top **State Advisory Council** (ELC SAC), meets quarterly and includes a broad membership of stakeholders from across the state, including parents, representatives of advocacy organizations, and representatives of organizations serving low income families. The ELC SAC is made up of all members of the BBF State Advisory Council, as well as several additional members representing organizations serving children with developmental delays or disabilities, statewide K-12 professional organizations, the statewide Council of Special Education Administrators, and others. ELC SAC members function as both ambassadors and advisors for the grant, offering feedback and advice on issues facing early childhood and providing additional communication avenues statewide. In 2016, our quarterly meetings focused on highlights of the APR, a panel discussion of the implementation of Act 166 (Vermont's universal, 10 hour/week, preK law), and the conceptual framework for our fifth year application.

The **Implementation Team**, hosted by Vermont's lead agency, the Governor's Office, provides leadership and direct oversight of the progress of the grant, and includes the five major players in the grant's implementation: the Agency of Education, the Child Development Division of the Agency of Human Services, the Department of Health of the Agency of Human Services, Building Bright Futures, and the philanthropic sector, made up of the Permanent Fund, the Turrell Fund and the AD Henderson Foundation. As in 2015, there were a few changes to Implementation Team membership, as a result of turnover in grant related positions. In addition, we added the Promise Communities director to the Implementation Team, in order to stay more closely connected to community-level implementation. She, along with the Regions Manager for BBF, help to ground the focus of the group. Several of our Implementation team members directly oversee programs that serve children from low-income families, or children with developmental delays or disabilities. In general, the Implementation Team:

- monitors the progress of individual projects
- seeks deeper collaboration to enhance program effectiveness and systems integration whenever possible
- consciously addresses concerns and opportunities through a systems-building lens.
- on a quarterly basis, reviews financial statements

#### Major Governance-related changes in 2016 are:

- In 2016, the Implementation Team's work has changed from focusing on individual projects and problem solving, to focusing on deeper systems-level collaboration and connections across projects. We have spent quite a bit of meeting time discussing and planning for the fifth year extension.
- Under the leadership of a new Executive Director, Building Bright Futures has emerged as a leading and well respected voice in the early childhood field in Vermont. A few examples:
  - Conversations about sustainability with state partners are now moving forward. Plans are underway to increase BBF's state grant, which is the foundation of its funding structure.
  - The BBF State Advisory Council meetings always have a quorum for decision-making, and the

number of members of public who attend these meetings has increased substantially.

- As the Implementation Team discusses the need for an ongoing forum of cooperation between state agencies to resolve difficult issues in early childhood, BBF is always named as the heir apparent for this role, after the grant and its Implementation Team ends. Already, we collaborate closely on many levels, including agenda setting at the State Advisory Councils level. For instance, we deliberately included the BBF's State Advisory Council in planning for the fifth year application. Several members of the Implementation Team serve on BBF's State Advisory Council.
- The positions of Grant Director and Project Manager were moved to the Agency of Human Services as of March, 2016. The Grant Director reports to the Deputy Commissioner of the Child Development Division within the Department of Children and Families. As in the past, the Project Manager of the Early Learning Challenge grant reports to the Grant Director, and the Financial Manager reports to the Financial Director of the Agency of Human Services.
- The Grant Administrator for AOE left in November, and that position is unfilled at this point in time. That position reports to the Director, PreK through Middle Division at AOE; and the Grant Administrator for the Child Development Division (CDD) reports to the Director of Statewide Systems and Community Collaboration for the Child Development Division. The Grant Director and the Fiscal Manager met monthly during 2016 with the Agency of Education project leads, to support oversight of their grant projects. There has not been a need for the "operations team," as described in earlier APRs, to meet during 2016.

Though not specifically part of the governance of the ELC grant, an Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Team was established to further enhance cross agency and organization collaboration. This group meets monthly, and is composed of the representatives of each relevant agency or department from AOE and AHS who serve on the Building Bright Futures and Early Learning Challenge State Advisory Councils, as well as the Executive Director of Building Bright Futures. The ECICT serves an important function in the Data Governance program (as described in E2) and has focused on understanding, in order to address, the fragmentation of children's mental health programs and services since April, 2016.

### **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.

In the third year of the grant, we continued to involve a broad array of early childhood stakeholders in our work. At the highest level, our Early Learning Challenge State Advisory Council includes representatives of advocacy organizations, including those serving children with developmental delays or disabilities, statewide K-12 professional organizations, the statewide Council of Special Education Administrators, representatives from the state agencies of Education and Human Services, the Vermont Legislature, at large members, parents, representatives from higher education, the business community, and philanthropy. In 2016, this group met three times, in conjunction with the Building Bright Futures State Advisory Council.

This process is replicated at the regional as well as individual project level. First, Building Bright Futures (Project 2), continues to strengthen and enrich the participation in its 12 Regional Councils throughout Vermont. Nearly 355 members - representing home-based and center-based child care providers, schools, libraries, faith-based, businesses, hospitals, health organizations, public safety, state agencies, United Ways, parents, and philanthropy - met regularly to integrate local education, health and human services delivery systems to impact the lives of young families and their children, birth to age eight.

Second, each project lead considered what existing work groups or organizations were doing similar work, and identified other essential voices that needed to be at the table. A great example in 2016 was the creation and

expansion of the STARS Promotion Workgroup. Inspired by the significant increase in participation in Vermont's TQRIS, known as STARS, ELC grant management helped lead a collaborative effort to promote STARS to parents and prospective parents. The work group started with representatives from the Child Development Division and Vermont Birth to Five, who had strong interest in moving the project forward. In our first meeting, we asked the question "who else should be at the table?", and soon had representation from the STARS Coordinators Office, Let's Grow Kids, Building Bright Futures, and the Vermont Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies. Critically, in fall of 2016, after hiring a marketing research firm to conduct research and planning for an outreach campaign, the group realized a crucial voice was missing - that of child care providers who participate in STARS and are natural messengers to parents. We now have a provider participating on the workgroup and are planning meaningful opportunities for providers to engage in reviewing research and message development going forward.

Beyond these advisory groups, we endeavored to set up our communication vehicles to be as broad and accessible as possible, given the nature of the ELC work. Ongoing communications strategies that have been central to grant implementation include:

- [Monthly or bi-monthly updates](#) to an expanding list of early childhood stakeholders (currently over 300) that include information on the implementation of individual projects as well broader updates about Vermont's early childhood system
  - [Fast Fact sheets](#) on the grant as a whole, as well as individual projects, and how grant efforts fit into VT's broader early childhood system-building efforts.
  - [A suite of webpages](#) within the Building Bright Futures website with information by project, updates, outcomes, and contact information.
  - Quarterly meetings of the Early Learning Challenge Grant State Advisory Council, coordinated with the Building Bright Futures (BBF) State Advisory Council meetings, to update key partners and advisors on grant processes.
  - Annual presentations on grant projects, progress, and outcomes at gatherings of Vermont's early childhood community including Vermont Early Childhood Day at the Legislature, the Vermont Association for the Education of Young Children (VAEYC) Conference and the Turrell Fund Day (a gathering of early childhood professionals, philanthropists and state agency leaders for a keynote address and award presentations).
  - Press releases in partnership with the Governor's Office and other state agencies for the launch of new initiatives including Promise Communities (Project 24) and Help Me Grow (Project 12)
  - Individual projects also implemented their own communication plans, utilizing communication materials developed by grant leadership as well as their own. For example, Help Me Grow had a robust communication plan that used national materials customized for Vermont, the ELC Fast Fact sheets, the BBF Regional Councils and other avenues.

The grant also relies on the BBF Regional Council structure for communicating about grant projects in the regions. The BBF Regional Council Coordinators have been particularly helpful in promoting the launch of the Help Me Grow statewide call center, as well as promoting the Promise Communities and Early Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (Early - MTSS) efforts.

For communication to specific audiences such as providers, school districts, and parents, we use existing outreach mechanisms within our partner agencies. The Child Development Division and the Agency of Education both maintain good contact lists for early childhood professionals. Our philanthropic partners at Let's Grow Kids and Vermont Birth to Five are particularly helpful in getting information to parents/the general public. Building Bright Futures also provides access to these communities through their monthly regional newsletters, Facebook pages, and regional websites where trainings, playgroups, conferences and other information is routinely shared with thousands of Vermonters. Despite these efforts, we acknowledge that we have work to do to authentically engage families in our efforts. This is something we will continue to address going forward.

## 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.

### ACT 166

In January of 2016, the AOE and CDD presented data to the legislature on the first year of voluntary implementation of Act 166, which was 2015. As of March 21, 2016, when the report was revised, they reported 128 public preK programs and 190 community based preK programs operating under Act 166 during 2015. We look forward to seeing the report for 2016, the first year of mandatory implementation. The report on 2015, when participation was voluntary, is available [here](#).

In addition, in July of 2016, AOE and CDD reported to the State Board of Education, at a State Board retreat on the topic of equity in preschool settings that are funded by Act 166. The full report is not available on line, but is available by request. The key points were:

- From 2014-15 to 2015-16, the proportion of PreK students eligible for school meals remained unchanged at 70% ineligible and 31% eligible.
- Likewise, eligibility for special ed services barely changed - from 83% with no IEP in 2014-15, to 84% with no IEP in 2015-16 at the preK level.
- Similarly, race/ethnicity data also remained unchanged, with 92% Caucasian and 8% races and ethnicities not Caucasian.
- The Champlain Valley (where the largest population center is) had the highest proportion of early implementers of Act 166.

In terms of Act 166's impact on the grant, we anticipate that it will continue to drive the need for more child care professionals to earn a BA with licensure in early childhood or early childhood special ed. To learn more about grant-led efforts to address this issue, see narrative D2 and B4.

### BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION

In 2016, after a year of intensive effort, the **Blue Ribbon Commission on Financing High Quality, Affordable Childcare** completed its work, and released its report in early 2017. (The Commission was described in detail in the 2015 APR). The report can be found [here](#). The report:

1. Defines the elements of a high-quality child care program
2. Models how much it would cost per infant, toddler, and preschooler to provide high-quality early care and learning
3. Estimates the total cost of high-quality care based on the number of children under 6 who have all available parents in the labor force and are therefore likely to need child care
4. Recommends how much families should be asked to contribute to child care to make it affordable for them
5. Calculates the current investment gap that would need to be filled after existing early childhood funding and parental contributions are taken into account

## 6. Recommends potential funding sources that could be used to fill this gap

Critical findings of the report include:

- “Vermont currently spends roughly \$130 million through state and federal investments in early care and learning. The Child Care Financial Assistance Program (CCFAP) helps 23% of families seeking access to regulated care, leaving the remaining roughly 75% of families to cover the full cost of tuition.
- To make care more affordable for families, providers offer financial support, including not collecting CCFAP co-payments. Doing so reduces the income of the business, limiting their ability to pay staff, buy supplies, and support quality improvements.
- The Commission defined the components of high quality care and estimated the cost of providing such care to children ages birth to 5 at both a center-based and a home-based program. This exercise yielded a center-based cost of roughly \$35,000 per child to care for infants and toddlers (0-2) and \$15,000 per child to care for preschoolers (3-5). For home-based care, it costs roughly \$41,000 per infant, \$21,000 per toddler, and \$14,000 per preschooler.
- These per-child costs were multiplied by varying demand levels to determine the program-level costs associated with serving Vermont's population of children birth to 5. The Commission requested to see three different demand levels: a) 24.7%, a 2007 federal estimate of non-relative care<sup>24</sup> b) 70.4%, the percent of Vermont children under 6 who have all available parents in the workforce<sup>25</sup> and c) 100%, all children in Vermont age birth to 5.
- Assuming half of the demand is met by center-based care and half of the demand is met by home-based care, the operational costs associated with serving 25% to 100% of the birth to 5 population range from roughly \$360 million to \$850 million.”

There was a significant amount of news coverage related to the release of the report, and there will be substantial follow up in the legislature during 2017 and 2018.

In terms of impact on the Early Learning Challenge grant, the findings of the BRC together with the continuing public education campaign of Let's Grow Kids, have raised awareness of the magnitude of the issue, both in terms of the promise of investing in early childhood, as well as the price tag of doing it right. This became evident in the 2016 state election, when early childhood was a key issue in the campaigns for state and local office and increased investment in early childhood education became a cornerstone of the incoming Governor's plan for his administration, highlighted in both his first Inaugural and Budget Addresses.

### **DEVELOPMENT REGISTRY**

The Vermont Department of Health completed a Universal Developmental Screening (UDS) Registry as part of our Health Department immunization registry that includes screening results for multiple tools: the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ), Ages and Stages Questionnaire-Social Emotional (ASQ:SE), and the Modified Checklist for Autism in Toddlers (M-CHAT). Legislation passed in 2016 that gives the Health Department legal authority to collect the screening data. In 2016, a pilot of the UDS Registry began with three primary care practice LAUNCH partner sites. These child health providers receive training on entering screening results in the UDS Registry. The UDS Registry offers a state-wide data collection system with reporting features for primary care providers including:

- a screening history report,
- screening follow up status, and
- children due for screening (according to the American Academy of Pediatrics Bright Futures Periodicity schedule).



In 2016, 430 early care and education providers in developmental surveillance and screening (through work with LAUNCH grant and Vermont Birth to Five) have been trained. For more information, see the narrative for in Section C(3).

### **CHANGE IN ADMINISTRATION**

During the 2016 governor's race, our partners Let's Grow Kids and Building Bright Futures, among others, organized gubernatorial forums in order to maintain a high level of visibility on early childhood for each candidate. Phil Scott, a moderate Republican who served as Lieutenant Governor under Governor Peter Shumlin, won the election handily. Governor Scott has pledged no new taxes of any kind, and has highlighted budget constraints and shortfalls, and the need to attract more young people to Vermont's workforce. His administration has made increased investments in early childhood a central issue, highlighting it in both his Inaugural and Budget Addresses. He and members of his cabinet will be featured speakers at Early Childhood Day at the Legislature in March, 2017.

### **Potential 2017 Legislation**

Proposed legislation of particular interest to those of us involved in the Early Learning Challenge grant include bills that would:

- **Increase CCFAP funding.** This was also one of the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendations.
- **Expand TEACH.** Project 16 includes substantial scholarship funding for participants in Vermont's TEACH program. Continuing TEACH was also a recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission.
- **Respond to Blue Ribbon Commission recommendations, as above.**
- **Establish universal home visiting:** As part of a bill to create a trauma-informed service director position in the Agency of Human Services, a universal home visiting program is proposed. Overall, the bill encourages the use of adverse childhood experience screening tools, incentivizes providers to use the screening tools, incorporates education in medical and nursing school curricula, and assesses regional capacity for program growth. Universal home visiting would expand Nurse-Family Partnership to all eligible women, and utilize both Parents as Teachers and Maternal Early Childhood Sustained Home Visiting to reach all women not eligible for Nurse Family Partnership.

### **Participating State Agencies**

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

There has not been any change in participation or commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies as described in our State Plan.

***DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES, THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK***

## 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.

As we noted in previous years, because this question asks specifically about whether the State has made progress in *developing or revising* these areas in the grant year, we have had to answer "No" to each item above. We have not made progress because the state already has each of these five components in its TQRIS. Vermont's TQRIS applies to all types of regulated programs, including Head Start and publicly funded prekindergarten education programs. In addition, as noted above, an evaluation was underway throughout 2015, and any changes to our TQRIS will be made in the future.

Vermont's TQRIS (STARS) was codified as state policy in 2008. It includes:

- 1) Early Learning and Development Standards: our TQRIS utilizes the Vermont Early Learning Standards.
- 2) Early Childhood Educator qualifications: our TQRIS utilizes Child and Program Assessment Systems (TS GOLD and ERS).
- 3) Family Engagement strategies: our TQRIS utilizes a Families and Communities arena, including a Strengthening Families and a Leadership focus.
- 4) Health Promotion strategies: our TQRIS includes some elements of health promotion such as credit for participating in the USDA Child and Adult Care food program. During this grant year, Vermont's ELC grant is now funding bonuses to STARS early learning and development programs for providing nutritious meals and/or snacks.
- 5) Effective Data Practices: The Child Development Division has a comprehensive data system, the Bright Futures Information System (BFIS), which documents critical information such as programs in STARS and their star levels, enrollment of children receiving subsidy, and grants and payments made to participating programs.

Project 6 supports the evaluation of STARS. The primary goals of this study are to: (1) evaluate the experiences of STARS participants and implementers to determine how the TQRIS is working to improve quality, and (2) to determine if the existing STARS framework produces rating levels that meaningfully differentiate higher quality programs from lower quality programs. For more information on the STARS evaluation, see section B(5).

In addition to this evaluation, we ensure measurable progress through the STARS Oversight Committee is a statewide standing committee that includes representatives from state agencies and stakeholder groups. This committee is charged with monitoring the implementation and quality of STARS. A STARS Evaluation Committee was formed to focus specifically on informing and providing feedback to the STARS Evaluation.

### **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.

After a major jump in the percentage of programs participating in STARS in Year One - from 42% to 72% - Vermont has consistently maintained between 70 - 80% participation. The ability to sustain this increased

participation over time bodes well for the quality of Vermont's early childhood system in the long term.

However, we fell short of our targets for participation in Year 3. We hoped to have 80% of all programs, and 90% of center-based programs participating. Instead 78% of all programs, and 83% of center-based programs are participating. We did not set targets for home-based participation, but we saw a decline in Year 3, from 77% to 74% of home-based providers participating.

For the first time, we saw a decrease in the *number* of programs participating in STARS. However, this was matched by a decrease in the total number of programs in the state, and as a result, our percentages didn't change dramatically. Since the baseline in September 2013, Vermont has seen a slow and steady decrease from 1435 total programs to 1240 total programs. The number of center-based programs has remained fairly constant, but we have more than 200 fewer home-based programs in Year 3 than we did in the baseline year. This loss is not unique to Vermont and aligns with national trends, though we are actually losing programs at a slower rate. According to a January 2017 report by the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), from 2006-2015 there was a 52% decrease in early learning and development programs nationwide, with the largest declines among family child care homes.

The state continues to partner with Vermont Birth to Five (VB5), a privately funded initiative that supports and incentivizes family child care home providers to participate in STARS. The work of this organization, that includes peer mentoring and financial incentives, has been a major reason that participation of family child care homes in STARS increased so dramatically from 25% in 2013. VB5 and the state have an ongoing commitment and agreement to implement strategies to assist those new to STARS to continue on their pathway to improve program quality and to make the most of their STARS participation.

Vermont employs several additional strategies to encourage TQRIS participation. For example, ELC funds build upon the practice of awarding one-time payments to programs as they achieve each new star level. Since 2014, ELC funds have supported annual bonuses for programs who have maintained the star level for a year. This is particularly appreciated by the programs that have achieved the highest star levels of 4 or 5. In addition, ELC funds annual bonuses for providing nutritious meals and/or snacks. There are ELDPs that have returned to STARS participation due to these payments. In general, bonuses for STARS participation and for nutritious meals and snacks have been greatly appreciated by STARS participating programs. In calendar year 2016, 511 annual bonus payments have gone out to programs. \$460,485.00 has been awarded to programs maintaining their STARS quality level and \$241,200.00 has been awarded for providing nutritious snacks and meals. The top three uses for bonus funds, as reported by programs, remain: materials or equipment for the program, professional development, and facility improvements. We do not require programs to spend the money in any particular way. There are no parameters on the bonus funds.

In 2016, grant leadership continued to facilitate a public/private effort to promote parent awareness of STARS as a tool to find quality childcare. Partners include the Child Development Division, the STARS coordinators office, the VT Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (VACCRRA), Let's Grow Kids, Building Bright Futures, and Vermont Birth to Five. It was always envisioned that STARS could be used by parents as one tool for finding quality child care. However, because of previously low rates of participation, there was never a dedicated public outreach effort to promote parent awareness of STARS. Thanks to increased participation levels in the last three years, the time is now right to promote STARS to parents and prospective parents. Vermont received federal approval to reallocate up to \$100,000 out of Project 5 (STARS Bonuses) for a consultant to lead the research and planning for an effective public outreach campaign.

Vermont-based marketing research firm Fifth Element Associates began their contract in September of 2016 and spent the fall designing a research phase that includes three regional parent focus groups and a statewide parent telephone survey. Together, the focus groups and the survey will provide critical information about parent beliefs and values when it comes to STARS and choosing child care more broadly. Once the research phase is completed, Fifth Element will recommend updates to existing STARS messaging materials, such as the STARS brochure, and develop a marketing plan for getting the word out to parents. We hope that the wealth of knowledge gained from this process will enable providers participating in STARS to strengthen their marketing

communications with families, and help continue to drive increased participation in STARS.

The CDD (Child Development Division) also manages several grants that contribute to awareness of, and support for, participation in STARS. This include grants to the Vermont Association for the Education of Young Children (VAEYC) and the Vermont Child Care Providers Association (VCCPA) whose mentors support programs to improve quality including participation in STARS and achieving national accreditation. The STARS administrative staff also provides ongoing training and technical assistance for all programs interested in, and applying to, STARS. CDD licensing staff and multiple other organizations and agencies are familiar with STARS and encourage participation and connections with the most appropriate organization(s). Collectively, all of these organizations and individuals provide an underpinning for the success we have seen in STARS participation.

**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	268	100%	273	100%	278	100%	283	100%	288	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	42	93%	44	98%	44	98%	45	100%	45	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	597	42%	851	59%	993	68%	1,156	80%	1,372	95%
Other 1	367	69%	398	75%	450	85%	477	90%	504	95%
<i>Describe:</i>	Center based programs only									
Other 2	230	25%								
<i>Describe:</i>	Home based programs only									
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>	Family Friend and Neighbor was not included in the grant and legally exempt status will end (except for family members) by Sept 2016.									

<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	268	268	100%	285	285	100%	318	318	100%	373	373	100%			
<i>Specify:</i>	State-Funded Preschool														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	45	42	93%	59	56	95%	75	73	97%	71	67	94%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619															
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	1,435	597	42%	1,371	986	72%	1,318	1,045	79%	1,240	966	78%			
Other 1	530	367	69%	547	404	74%	542	449	83%	541	447	83%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Center based programs only														
Other 2	905	230	25%	824	582	71%	776	596	77%	699	519	74%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Home based programs only														
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>	Family Friend and Neighbor was not included in the grant and legally exempt status will end (except for family members) by Sept 2016.														

<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.

Vermont's children eligible for IDEA, Part C attend inclusive regulated programs with typically developing peers. We do not fund separate programs under this funding source.

Vermont's children eligible for IDEA, Part B, section 619 attend inclusive publicly funded prekindergarten education programs with typically developing peers. We do not fund separate programs under this funding source. The same is true for Title I under ESEA.

The data on state funded preschool programs was collected in the state's Bright Futures Information System as of 12/31/2016. This represents private and public programs that are prequalified to provide 10 hours of publicly funded preK under VT's Act 166.

The data on Head Start and Early Head Start programs includes programs fully funded by Head Start, and programs that receive Head Start services through partnerships with Head Start grantees. In Year Three, 26 of the programs were operation by Head Start grantees, while 41 programs were partnerships.

Here is the detail: of the 67 Head Start, Early Head Start, and Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships grantee and partnering sites that participated as STARS programs, 26 were sites in which Head Start, Early Head Start, and Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships grantee was the licensee and provided Head Start/Early Head Start/Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership services either as a stand-alone Head Start/Early Head Start program or in partnership with another regulated child care program such as a state-funded pre-k program in a public school or a private child care center, AND 41 were sites in which a partner such as a state-funded pre-k program in a public school or a private child care center was the licensee for the site and partnered with a Head Start, Early Head Start, or Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships grantee to provide Head Start/Early Head Start/Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership services.

Other 1 is an isolated group of the number of programs receiving CCDF funds - it represents only the licensed center based programs in Vermont participating in the TQRIS program. Other 2 is also another isolated group and includes only registered home based programs in Vermont participating in the TQRIS program.

The data from this table was generated through the BFIS annual reports, using what is current as of 12/31 of the reporting year (so for this report 12/31/2016). These numbers exclude the school age programs from our numbers.

### **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 pleased to see a steady increase in the number of state-funded PreK programs, all of which participate in STARS at the highest levels.

According to the Bright Futures Information System, as of December 31, 2016, there were 373 public and private programs prequalified to provide publicly funded PreK under VT's Act 166. This is 55 more programs than there were at the same time last year! This represents the first six months of mandatory implementation of Act 166, which began on July 1, 2016. The number of PreK programs also exceeds our Year 3 targets by almost 90!

After a major jump in the percentage of programs participating in STARS in Year One - from 42% to 72% - Vermont has consistently maintained between 70 - 80% participation. The ability to sustain this increased participation over time bodes well for the quality of Vermont's early childhood system in the long term.

However, we fell short of our targets for participation in Year 3. We hoped to have 80% of all programs, and 90% of center-based programs participating. Instead, 78% of all programs, and 83% of center-based programs, are participating. We did not set targets for home-based participation, but we saw a slight decline in Year 3, from 77% to 74% of home-based providers participating. In Year 4, we hope to reverse that trend, and move from 74% back to 77%.

For the first time, we saw a decrease in the *number* of programs participating in STARS. However, this was matched by a decrease in the total number of programs in the state, and as a result, our percentages didn't change dramatically. Since the baseline in September 2013, Vermont has seen a slow and steady decrease from 1435 programs to 1240 programs. The number of center-based programs has remained fairly constant, but we have lost more than 200 home-based programs since our baseline year. This loss is not unique to Vermont and aligns with national trends, though we are actually losing programs at a slower rate. According to a January 2017 report by the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), from 2006-2015 there was a 52% decrease in early learning and development programs nationwide, with the largest declines among family child care homes.

### **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.

Project 7 of Vermont's Early Learning Challenge grant supports the design of a rating and monitoring system to address the requirements of Vermont's Act 166: Universal Pre-Kindergarten Education (PreK) for private and public PreK programs. As of July 1, 2016, Act 166 was fully implemented by school districts in partnership with prequalified private community-based early learning and development programs. Criteria for prequalification and more information about the requirements of Act 166 can be found in the [text of the bill](#).

Project 7 took a major step forward in 2016, with the design of Vermont's PreK Monitoring System now well underway. In the spring, Early Learning Challenge and Preschool Development Expansion grant funds were used to contract with the Lewin Group for the design of the PreK monitoring system. Vermont's PreK monitoring system will utilize cross agency (AOE and AHS) existing structures such as prequalification status for PreK, child care licensing regulations, and Step Ahead Recognition System (STARS). The monitoring system is a joint agency responsibility between the Agency of Education and Agency of Human Services.

The Lewin Group has made substantial progress in the design of the system since their contract began in spring of 2016. They have held four stakeholder meetings with representatives from the AOE, the AHS Child Development Division, community-based child care providers, early education coordinators, early interventionists, mental health organizations, Building Bright Futures, Head Start, the Early Learning Challenge grant, and more. The system development process included a review of current monitoring, accreditation, and evaluation systems in Vermont and across the country.

The Lewin Team has identified 4 primary components for the monitoring system. These include:

- **Application process:** Process for reviewing and responding to applications submitted by prekindergarten providers for qualification as specified in Act 166
- **Ongoing monitoring:** Process for monitoring the continued compliance of prekindergarten providers with Act 166, and consequences for non-compliance
- **Reporting:** Process for reporting monitoring results to providers, the state, the Act 166 Inter-Agency Coordinating Team, and other stakeholders as appropriate.
- **Administrative Review:** Process for prekindergarten providers to appeal any monitoring decisions.

The PreK Monitoring System aligns with the evaluation of our TQRIS, STARS (for more information, see narrative B5). The alignment between the PreK Monitoring system and STARS is a critical aspect of establishing a comprehensive and sustainable monitoring system. All private and public programs must meet STARS rating criteria to be prequalified under Act 166. All programs must also be in regulatory compliance with Agency of Human Services Child Development Division's Childcare Licensing Regulations.

Currently the Lewin Group, with guidance from the PreK Monitoring stakeholder group, AOE and AHS is working on the ongoing monitoring process and how to integrate it with existing infrastructure and processes, such as AHS child care licensing and STARS. We look forward to piloting and evaluating the new system in spring 2017.

A major component of Project 7 is also the use of Environmental Rating Scales (ERS) as the primary program assessment tool used in our TQRIS (STARS). Two Anchor Assessors for ERS were hired in December of 2014. Between August 2015 and Dec 2016, 149 ERS assessments have taken place. The average score of an ERS assessment performed between August 2015 - early January 2017 was 4.69, which is significantly lower than the average score of an ERS assessment performed prior to the deployment of our Anchor Assessors. The reliability scores that our current assessors have achieved assure us that when a program in STARS has an ERS assessment the program is receiving an accurate score. In the past, assessors received basic training, but not reliability training. Under that system, program scores were not accurate and were, in fact, much higher than national averages would suggest they should be. The higher scores were a problem because programs were not able to use the scores to determine what practices needed improvement based on the inaccurate information they were getting.

The increased quality of ERS assessment results will become part of the overall coordinated system of program monitoring. It is important to note that the ERS assessors also provide training and mentoring opportunities for programs prior to a formal assessment. If a mentoring visit was provided for the two-point level, then a different assessor provides the formal scored assessment to determine if the program may achieve 3 or 4 points in the Program Practices Arena of STARS.

#### MAKING RATING AND MONITORING MORE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE

A grant-funded effort to help parents better understand STARS as a tool for finding and selecting child care continued in 2016, with the goal of launching an outreach campaign in 2017. (Please see B2 narrative for more detail about STARS promotion.)

As the Rating and Monitoring system is piloted during 2017, we will closely watch for opportunities for coordination in terms of outreach and messaging.

**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.

We continue to see a positive trend of more programs with ratings in the top tiers of STARS. In 2016, we exceeded our Year 3 targets for the number of programs with 3 and 4 STARS. However, we fell just short of our Year 3 target for the number of programs with 5 STARS and had three fewer 5 star programs in Year 3 than in Year 2. Overall, there are currently 254 more 3, 4, and 5 star programs than there were when we applied for the grant in September 2013, with 62 more 3 and 4 star programs in 2016 alone.

The jump in three, four, and five star programs is likely due to the implementation of Act 166, or Universal PreK, in Vermont. In order to provide public preK and access public funding, programs have to meet quality requirements (national accreditation, 4 or 5 stars, or 3 stars with an approved plan). The law was partially implemented in 2015, which helped explain the increase in Year Two. It was fully implemented in 2016, which helps explain the continued increase, especially among 3 STAR providers, which represents the threshold for Act 166 participation. Given that the law requires 3 STAR programs to move toward 4 and 5 STARS, we expect to continue to see private child care programs moving into the higher levels of STARS.

In addition, strong support of programs seeking to attain higher levels of STARS has helped to fuel this increase. STARS coordinators and VB5 mentors continue to provide crucial technical assistance and guidance to providers working their way through the TQRIS. Our STARS bonuses, and our many workforce development projects (see section D2), have also contributed to the increase.

We also want to highlight two quality improvement projects of the grant that made significant strides in 2016: Project 8 Specialized Child Care, and Project 4 Expand Strengthening Families Child Care Model.

**SPECIALIZED CHILD CARE**

2016 saw a continuing increase in the number of specialized child care (SCC) providers - those providers who care for children most at risk - participating in STARS, in part due a new requirement that any new specialized child care provider have at least a 3 star rating. As of August 2016, 68% of SCC providers were at the 3 star level or higher, up from 54% in December of 2013! We expect to see this trend continue, as existing providers will also need to attain the 3, 4 or 5 star level in 2018

2016 was a busy and productive year for Project 8 (Specialized Child Care). The Project 8 Work Group, which includes representatives from the Child Development Division, child care coordinators, and center and family home programs finalized new standards for SCC provider:

- At least a 3-star rating for any new SCC providers is required as of January 1, 2017.
- An on-site visit by a CIS Specialized Child Care Coordinator is required for all new providers, to meet and discuss the new standards outlined in the new Agreement, observe their programs and offer resources

and supports.

- All directors, lead teachers, and primary staff of new and existing programs are required to complete the Family Services Divisions online mandated reporters training
- The Basic Specialized Child Care 6-hour training curriculum was updated and revised, and the work group coordinated and offered a “train the trainer” in October 2016 to increase the number of qualified instructors across the state. At that meeting, 25 instructors were trained in the updated BSC curriculum, and the new BSC training curriculum is now available for instructors to use.

These new standards go into effect January 1, 2017, for any new SCC providers, and by August 31, 2018, for all existing SCC providers.

In 2017, the Project 8 Workgroup has two specific goals:

- Coordinate with various other state and community resources who also offer professional development;
- Identify advanced specialized training courses, including core courses that increase awareness of specific risk factors that affect Vermont's children and families. These advanced specialized courses will fulfill six hours of the required 15 hours of professional development for center directors and registered family child care providers

### **STRENGTHENING FAMILIES**

Vermont is one of more than thirty states shifting policy and practice in order to apply the Strengthening Families framework to all programs working with children and families. Strengthening Families™ is a research-informed framework that builds upon family strengths, enhances child development, and reduces the likelihood of child abuse and neglect. The Early Learning Challenge grant is funding Vermont Birth to Five's efforts to support the expansion of the Strengthening Families Child Care Center-based model to include family child care homes. The grant also funds an evaluation of Vermont's Strengthening Families Child Care models.

Vermont Birth to Five is using the Strengthening Families framework to build upon the naturally occurring relationship between home-based child care providers and families. Vermont Birth to Five's Strengthening Families project creates hub-and-spoke networks where home-based providers receive extensive training to build protective factors, make a strong connection to community resources, and connect families to needed supports and services.

The project has been successful in enhancing provider engagement with families and the quality of care for children. It also provides concrete support for families in times of need. Highlights from 2016 include:

- 60 family child care programs participating \*
- 560 children from 413 families enrolled at participating family child care programs \*
- 247 (41%) children receiving CCFAP (child care subsidy) \*
- 172 (30.8%) children receiving 100% CCFAP \*
- 31 (51%) participating programs at 4/5 stars, compared to 19 (29%) programs at the beginning of the project.
- 23 (42%) participating programs at 3 stars, compared to 20 (32%) at the beginning of the project.
- Health measures are all positive: health insurance (555/99%), medical home (554/98.8%), immunizations (549/98%) \*
- Continuity of care remained strong for the vast majority of children: children exited the program (54/10%), children entered programs (44/7.6%), and children absent more than 6 times (66/11.8%)\*
- Families enrolled in participating programs received a total of \$54,929 for emergency needs including: alternative child care, groceries, electric bill, school clothes and supplies, car repair, lice treatment, diapers, stroller, special education equipment, rental deposit, winter clothing, car seat, heat after fuel assistance funds were exhausted/propane, wood, oil.



\*average(s)

**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>	596	986	1,020	1,085	1,100
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	77	285	240	230	215
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	100	187	200	225	225
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	112	158	200	225	235
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	139	145	165	175	185
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>	169	211	215	230	240
<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>	596	986	1,045	966	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	77	285	235	148	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	100	187	195	144	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	112	158	198	241	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	139	145	191	210	
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>	169	211	226	223	
<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.

Data is accurate and gathered from the Child Development Division, Bright Futures Information System (BFIS). Participation in STARS is directly linked to quality bonus payments and to child care financial assistance rates paid on behalf of enrolled children. BFIS captures this information and reports can be generated from this information.

Data represents the number of centers and homes caring for birth to age 6 that are participating in the QRIS as of 12/31/2016.

The final row, "NUMBER OF PROGRAMS ENROLLED BUT NOT YET RATED" does not apply to Vermont so we have left it blank.

**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.

In 2016 we saw a noticeable decrease in the total number of programs participating in STARS, from 1045 to 966, and fell short of our target for Year 3 by more than 100 programs. However, because of a parallel decrease in the total number of programs in the state, this still represents 78% participation.

We continue to see a positive trend of more programs with ratings in the top tiers of STARS. In 2016, exceeded our Year 3 targets for the number of programs with 3 and 4 STARS. However, we fell just short of our Year 3 target for the number of programs with 5 STARS and had three fewer 5 star programs in Year 3 than in Year 2.

**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"?

Vermont has a 5 tier rating system, and for the purposes of B4 C2, defines high quality as being at the 3, 4 or 5 tier levels. Vermont's TQRIS is called "STARS" which is the acronym for the Vermont SStep Ahead Recognition System.

Programs that are NAEYC accredited have a simplified application to participate in STARS. The simplified application awards points for NAEYC Accreditation so the program achieves 5 stars (the highest tier level) if the program has not had a serious regulatory violation within a year and if the program has attained Specialized Child Care status with the Child Development Division.

**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	5,711	100%	5,871	100%	5,971	100%	6,071	100%	6,171	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	1,890	100%	1,890	100%	1,890	100%	1,890	100%	1,890	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	183	61%	243	70%	318	80%	403	90%	498	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	925	100%	925	100%	935	100%	935	100%	935	100%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	2,733	100%	2,760	100%	2,788	100%	2,816	100%	2,844	100%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,721	44%	3,064	50%	3,677	60%	4,167	68%	4,597	75%
Other 1	1,001	100%	1,011	100%	1,021	100%	1,031	100%	1,042	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Early Education Initiative Grant Programs (see Data Notes)									
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	5,711	5,711	100%	5,871	5,871	100%	5,681	5,681	100%	7,326	7,326	100%			
<i>Specify:</i>	Publicly Funded PreK														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	1,890	1,890	100%	1,685	1,685	100%	1,720	1,720	100%	1,711	1,711	100%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	298	183	61%	341	222	65%	636	430	68%	1,021	732	72%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	998	925	100%	977	977	100%	968	968	100%	1,071	1,071	100%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	2,733	2,733	100%	2,639	2,639	100%	2,925	2,925	100%	3,241	3,241	100%			
Programs receiving CCDF funds	6,184	2,721	44%	5,091	2,744	54%	5,389	3,332	62%	5,393	3,430	64%			
Other 1	1,001	1,001	100%	1,031	1,031	100%	1,236	1,236	100%	12	12	100%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Early Education Initiative Grant Programs (see Data Notes)														
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.

In Vermont, PreK is universal and inclusive. Except for age, it does not target specific populations. Therefore, we have listed the total number of children in publicly funded preK for each respective school year. Children with high needs are all in high quality, because we require all publicly funded preK programs to be in the top tiers of TQRIS.

Data Source for publicly funded PreK: For Year Three (the 2015-2016 school year), PreK enrollment data comes from the FY16 PreK Evaluation Report. Prior year data came from the School Census on October 1 each year; baseline SY 12-13, Year One SY 13-14, and Year Two SY 14-15. However, because of the partial implementation of Act 166 starting in July 2015, the October census did not provide the most accurate enrollment data for Year Three.

Note regarding: 100% of state funded preschool program in top tiers:

Though it is a requirement that PreK programs must be at the highest level of STARS in order to receive public funding, if a program is nationally accredited and chooses not to participate in STARS, that program would still qualify for public PreK funds. For that reason, although there is slightly less than 100% STARS participation, we can be sure that all publicly funded PreK programs are of the highest quality.

Head Start Year Two Actual data comes from the Head Start Program Information Report for the 2015-2016 Program year. The Baseline, Year One, and Year Two data consists of cumulative enrollment data. Cumulative enrollment is different from funded enrollment. Cumulative Enrollment consists of ALL children who have been enrolled in the program and have attended at least one class or, for programs with home-based options, received at least one home visit. In contrast, funded enrollment is the total number of enrollees (children and pregnant women) the program was funded to serve. Funded enrollment can also be defined as funded slots. More than one child may fill a slot during the program year due to a child leaving the program for various reasons, such as child and his/her family moving to another place outside of the Head Start/Early Head Start program's service area. When a slot becomes vacant, Head Start/Early Head Start programs will enroll a different child to fill the slot.

The number of children that are funded in IDEA Part C is extracted from Vermont's Bright Futures Information System enrollment data on children who have service needs of protective service or child with special health need and receive IDEA Part C. This data represents all children receiving services in calendar year 2016.

Data Source for Part B, 619 is: Child Count December 1, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 respectively. The numbers that are presented above are limited to the children with disabilities who participate and receive special education services in inclusive early learning and development settings, not including those in kindergarten. All inclusive settings must be at the higher tiers of STARS in order to receive state funding. Other Part B services may take place in the home, or in a one-on-one setting and therefore aren't eligible for TQRIS participation.

Data Source for Title I: Title I Participation Report for the 2015-2016 school year

CCDF funded programs: The data from this table was generated through the BFIS annual reports, using what is current as of 12/31 of the reporting year (so for this report 12/31/2016). These numbers exclude the school age programs from our numbers.

Data Source for Early Education Initiative (EEI): Early Education Initiative Annual Reports (July 2016 for SY 2015-16) from grantees. EEI serves children who are ineligible or inadequately served by existing early childhood education programs. Coordinated with community programs to avoid duplication and to make the best possible use of resources, EEI services also fill gaps created by restrictive requirements or insufficient resources.



### **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.

Vermont state policy requires that all publicly funded PreK programs be in the top tiers of STARS. Additionally, VT children attending Head Start programs, or receiving funding from IDEA, Part B, section 619 or Title 1, almost always served in high quality programs.

We are proud of this commitment to quality, and glad to see that more children participating in publicly-funded PreK since the passage of Act 166. There were 1645 more children enrolled in PreK in Year 3 than in Year 2. The Year 3 comes from the 2015-2016 school year, when implementation of Act 166 was optional. We anticipate an even more significant jump in Year 4, representing full implementation of Act 166.

Another goal for this performance measure is to increase the percentage of children receiving IDEA Part C services and children receiving CCDF funds who are in high quality programs. We have made steady progress on this goal since the grant was implemented, but are falling short of our targets.

With 64% of children receiving CCDF funds now in programs with 3, 4, and 5 STARS, we fell just short of our Year 3 target of 68%, but continue to make progress from our baseline of 44%.

Our Year 3 target for children receiving Part C services was to have 90% in high quality programs, and we fell short with 72%, although we have increased this percentage point every year of the grant. We continue to see a marked increase in VT's caseload of young children needing protective services.

We look forward to continued growth in the percentage of children receiving Part C services in high quality care since passing a requirement in 2016 under Project 8 (Specialized Child Care) of the grant that requires programs that serve children who receive Part C services to be at 3, 4, or 5 STARS levels.

### **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.

Project 6 supports the evaluation of our TQRIS, known as STARS. The primary goals of this study are to:

- (1) evaluate the experiences of STARS participants and implementers to determine how the TQRIS is working to improve quality, and
- (2) to determine if the existing STARS framework produces rating levels that meaningfully differentiate higher quality programs from lower quality programs.

The STARS evaluation and validation study includes four main activities designed to address the two primary research questions noted above: (1) assess the key concepts of the STARS TQRIS; (2) examine the measurement strategies used to determine STARS ratings (i.e., the verification process and the distribution of STARS indicators); (3) examine the perceptions of providers, mentors, and key stakeholders; and (4) examine the outputs of the STARS rating process to determine if the rating criteria meaningfully differentiate higher quality programs from lower quality programs. Over the course of 2016 the independent evaluator, Child Trends, made progress on all four activities and added three new enhancements to the study design. A summary of 2016 progress is included below.

In January 2016 Child Trends presented findings of the analysis of STARS key concepts and the distribution of STARS indicators by program type and level to the STARS Evaluation Committee. The results of these analyses

were used to inform a set of surveys for providers, mentors, and key stakeholders that were launched in the spring of 2016:

- **Provider survey.** From April to May of 2016, all STARS providers were invited to participate in a survey, which asked about their general program characteristics; motivations for participating in STARS; perceptions of and experiences with STARS; and changes made as a direct result of participating in STARS. In total, 596 providers responded to the survey, a 59% response rate.
- **STARS mentors** were also invited to participate in a survey to better understand the background and characteristics of the mentors working with STARS providers, the guidance they receive on mentoring programs in STARS based on the agency/entity they work for, the activities they engage in with providers, reflections on their successes/challenges, and their perceptions on STARS. The survey was open for one month during which time 25 mentors responded, a 47% response rate.
- **Key stakeholder survey.** The third survey was shared with STARS key stakeholders --individuals on the STARS Evaluation and Oversight Committees, legislators who have been involved with STARS, licensing specialists, and other members of the Vermont early childhood community. The primary goals of this survey were to gather stakeholders' perceptions of the successes and challenges with STARS, and to gather recommendations for changes or improvements to the system. The survey was open from June through July during which time 62 stakeholders submitted surveys, a 64% response rate.

Over the summer Child Trends completed a document review and key informant interview with members of the STARS office to document the mechanics of the STARS rating process. The team reviewed files and documented the steps involved in assigning a program rating to ensure the process is reliable and consistently administered with all STARS providers. The results of this work may help to inform future refinements to current policies/procedures to review and verify sources of evidence used to assign program ratings.

In the late summer and early fall the fourth and final major research activity was launched. Child Trends hired and trained five observers to conduct independent observations in STARS classrooms using the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS). By December, 142 classrooms were recruited into the study (40% of overall goal of 355 classrooms). This sample includes child care centers and family child care homes at all STARS levels. As noted above, in the summer of 2016 CDD was able to reallocate a portion of RTT-ELC funds to this study, which allowed for three important enhancements to the design of the current study. Specifically, these resources have enabled the Child Trends field team to: (1) collect a full sample of ECERS-R and ITERS-R observations that were beyond the scope of the original study design; (2) conduct an ECERS-R/ECERS-3 comparability study in a sub-sample of programs; and (3) provide a detailed feedback report to each teacher who receives an ITERS-R or ECERS-R observation. These enhancements will not only support the quality of the data needed for the validation study but also provide a valuable professional development benefit to the providers participating in these data collection efforts.

## 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 new birth to grade three Vermont Early Learning Standards (VELS) were reviewed, approved and adopted by the State Board of Education in August 2015. In 2016, we have worked to make sure the VELS are incorporated throughout our early childhood system.

The VELS are posted on the Agency of Education website and can be accessed online at <http://education.vermont.gov/early-education/early-learning-standards>. In 2016-17 we continue to design a VELS interactive web platform. The website is being designed for use by practitioners, families, and early childhood leaders, and will include the full content of the VELS. The website will include interactive links to relevant free resources, videos, and suggested evidence based practices and supporting activities across each domain and age group (birth thru age 8). For practitioners, the website will also house interactive e-learning modules to provide readily accessible professional learning opportunity to complete and receive professional development hours.

In the December 2016, the **VELS Family Engagement** contract was awarded to AnLar Group through an RFP process. Work is underway to design and conduct regional family focused trainings, family guides to the VELS, VELS calendar, and additional family resources. The training modules will be housed on the VELS website. All family engagement materials and resources will be aligned with VELS practitioner training modules, materials and resources to ensure a common message, look and design of deliverables.

**VELS "The Right Stuff"** was designed and fully implemented beginning Fall 2016. The Right Stuff is an ongoing monthly VELS resource-sharing newsletter that reaches over 400 early childhood educators and leaders across Vermont. "The Right Stuff" highlights one domain of the VELS each month and is located for your review at <http://fpg.unc.edu/presentations/right-stuff>.

#### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A major highlight of 2016 was the VELS Institute, which took place June 20-24, 2016 at Champlain College. Over 200 participants who work with children birth through third grade and their families attended a two-day institute and left with a copy of the VELS, as well as resources and information for using the VELS to support high-quality learning opportunities for each young Vermont child.

Through presentations, connections with other colleagues, conversations, and reflection, participants left better prepared to use the VELS to:

- Support the continuum of learning and development from birth through third grade;
- Support each young child, with emphasis on children who are culturally, linguistically, and individually diverse;

- Build inclusive programs and practices;
- Help families discover a tool to support their child's learning and development; and
- Encourage and support family engagement

The institute was the first in a series of professional learning opportunities on the VELS that will be available to early childhood professionals in 2016-2017. Other offerings include in-depth learning on the sections of the VELS, Master Classes to help instructors incorporate the VELS in coursework, and regional presentations. Design, development, delivery, and evaluation of professional development on the newly revised VELS is part of a contract AOE awarded to Camille Catlett, Scientist Emerita of the Frank Porter Graham Institute at the University of North Carolina. The contract began in May 2016 and continues through December 2017.

VELS was also a highlight of Vermont's Education for Young Children's (VAEYC) fall conference.

To review VELS powerpoints, resources and toolkits please click on the following link <http://fpg.unc.edu/presentations/vaeyc-2016>

#### ALIGNMENT AND INTEGRATION

The newly revised VELS are aligned with the following:

- For teachers of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers, the revised VELS are aligned and incorporate Developmentally Appropriate Practices (NAEYC) and Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Recommended Practices ;
- For preschool teachers working in Head Start settings and for teachers and caregivers in Early Head Start infant and toddler settings, the VELS are aligned with the 2015 Federal Office of Head Start's Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework, Ages Birth to Five;
- For K-3 teachers, the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics, the Next Generation Science Standards, add CASEL here and Vermont's Grade Level Expectations are all built into the VELS.

The revised Early Childhood Educator and Early Childhood Special Educator were aligned to the revised Vermont Early Learning Standards.

Additionally, professionals progressing on Vermont's early childhood career ladder will find that at each level, VELS informs the content. The new (and old) VELS are aligned very closely with the Vermont Core Knowledge and Competencies for Early Childhood Professionals in the Core Area of Knowledge-Child Development. All instructors in the Vermont Instructor Registry, who are training early childhood professionals, must understand VELS and apply this knowledge in the context of their instruction and practice.

The new Ready for Kindergarten! Survey (R4K!S) domain areas have been cross-walked with the new VELS with 91% alignment of items and 81% alignment of standards.

Act 166, Vermont's universal PreK law, requires that school districts and prequalified public PreK programs align their curriculum with the VELS. Early childhood programs must submit evidence to the AOE about curriculum alignment with VELS as part of the approval process.

Vermont's new child care licensing regulation standards also align with VELS.

### **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 the spring of 2016, the vacancy for Comprehensive Assessment Coordinator was posted and position offered. The new assessment coordinator, Ellen Cairns, was hired at .8 FTE for much of 2016. The coordinator's position increased to 1 FTE in November 2016 to support completion of TS GOLD, CLASS, EduSnap trainings and writing of Vermont's Early Childhood Assessment guidance manual. This manual is the companion document to Vermont's Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System (VECCAS) framework.

The VECCAS framework was completed in the fall of 2016 and forwarded to AOE leadership for review. Members of the VECCAS stakeholder group, plus new interested members, formed a work group to plan and draft the VECCAS guidance manual. The work group met several times over in the fall, and we are on track to have the guide finished and distributed to the field by the end of 2017.

The assessment coordinator attended national trainings to become a certified observer and trainer on both the PreK and K-3 modules of CLASS Coordinator Classroom Assessment Scoring System (**CLASS**). To build knowledge and capacity of CLASS across Vermont, as a certified trainer, the coordinator conducted six CLASS Pre-K Introductory trainings throughout the state, to a total of 80 participants, as well as six CLASS Pre-K Observation trainings, to a total of 72 participants.

In the first half of the year, the AOE offered 11 TS GOLD Introductory and 9 TS GOLD Advanced trainings throughout the state training up to 100 early childhood educators and administrators. TS GOLD trainers are hired as temporary employees of the AOE. Positions were posted for trainers and observers for TS GOLD and CLASS, as well as EduSnap observers, in the fall of 2016, but did not receive qualified applicants. The vacant positions were reposted with an intent to hire 5-7 qualified trainers so that TS GOLD and CLASS trainings are offered and conducted in 2017.

### 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.

In order to address these areas of health promotion, this narrative is broken down into sections. The components of health promotion within the Early Learning Challenge grant are bulleted below. Each component reinforces the work of the others:

- Home Visiting
- Developmental Screening
- Child Care Consultation and Training
- Promoting Early Childhood Development (Early MTSS)

#### **HOME VISITING:**

Early Learning Challenge grant funding supports the implementation of two evidence-based home visiting models through Children's Integrated Services - Parents as Teacher (PAT) and the Maternal Early Childhood Sustained Home visiting model (MECSH)- as part of Children's Integrated Services. The Vermont Parent Child Center network is implementing Parents As Teachers, a family support based model. MECSH is a nurse-based model, which will be implemented by home health agencies.

Lorna Corbett, RN, BSN, was hired as the Nursing & Family Support Administrator for the CIS State Team and began her position August 1, 2016. Lorna Corbett and the Children's Integrated Services Director, Terri Edgerton, of the Child Development Division (CDD), continue to meet with Vermont Department of Health (VDH) staff on a regular basis to ensure collaboration with home visiting in Vermont. VDH staff share strategies used in their Maternal, Infant, Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) funded programs and the LAUNCH project. The CDD team worked closely with John Burley, the Data Analyst in the Department of Health (VDH), in the development of a database, called PAT 1, that will collect information for fidelity reports for PAT and MECSH. Both programs require annual reporting to ensure program fidelity.

MECSH is now being implemented in 6 regions. A train-the-trainer training was held in October of 2016. 5 people were trained as trainers and an additional 7 MECSH nurses were trained. One additional region participated in this training. We continue to have monthly community of practice calls with the implementing sites and the state. Ann Giombetti, Home Visiting Administrator of MIECHV funded programs at MCH/VDH participates in those calls as well. Lorna and Ann meet regularly to discuss the coordination and implementation of home visiting nursing services across the state. We are currently working with the University of South Wales on establishing guidance to support a one-to-one mentor-mentee model of training for organizations that have small practitioner numbers and/or low staff turnover. The mentoring program is designed to support practitioners to:

- gain beginning competence in working in the MECSH Program and using the FPM (Family Partnership Model) as soon as appropriate after they commence working with the organization, and
- practice safely and confidently with families.

We plan to implement this in the first Quarter of 2017.

A 5-day statewide training for the first cohort of family support workers (FSW's) implementing Parents as Teachers (PAT) was held in April of 2016. 5 agencies participated, including an Early Head Start program. Due to staffing limitations, only 4 of these sites are currently implementing and Lorna will meet with the 5<sup>th</sup> agency after the supervisor returns from maternity leave. The second cohort of FSWs were trained at a 5-day statewide training in November 2016. 9 agencies participated. Lorna is scheduling site visits with each of the agencies to assess level of implementation.

Vermont's home visiting programs are aligned with the outcomes developed by the Vermont Home Visiting Alliance.

We look forward to this project being fully staffed by the hiring of the Home Visitor Coordinator in early 2017. We will be moving ahead with program performance monitoring, data review, and ongoing professional development opportunities for PAT and MECSH home visitors.

## **DEVELOPMENTAL SCREENING**

### *Help Me Grow Vermont*

Fully implemented in 2015, the *Help Me Grow Vermont (HMG VT)* system improves access to existing resources and services for young children and families and promotes parent-engaged developmental monitoring and screening for all Vermont children. The four *HMG VT* system components are: a centralized access point, family & community outreach, provider outreach, and data collection and analysis.

### *HMG VT Central Access Point*

Our centralized telephone point of access is the *Help Me Grow Vermont 2-1-1 Contact Center* which provides a personalized model of care coordination. Trained *HMG Child Development Specialists* at the call center offer a "go-to" place for family members and providers seeking information, support, community resources, and referrals. The *HMG Child Development Specialists* answer family's questions about their child's development and behavior and offer high quality parent education resources - tools and tips to support parents and caregivers to better understand child development, find teachable moments during every day routines, and address challenging behaviors. By strengthening protective factors in families, *HMG VT* supports parents to promote their child's social and emotional well-being. Specialists link to developmental screening when appropriate and refer to community resources and programs. We have two full-time *HMG Child Development Specialists* and also work with the 2-1-1 Resource Manager and Trainer to keep the regional resource database accurate and up to date. Calls/contacts have continued to increase in 2016 (see below under *HMG VT Data and Analysis*). Of note, the *HMG VT Contact Center* was selected to participate in a Strengthening Families Protective Factors national pilot this year with *HMG National Center* and the Center for the Study of Social Policy.

Our [www.helpmegrowvt.org](http://www.helpmegrowvt.org) website is almost completed and will be launched in 2017. This *HMG Vermont* website will offer a clearinghouse of early childhood information for families and providers, and include an online referral process for community service providers and healthcare providers to refer directly to the *HMG Child Development Specialists*. Families will also be able to self-refer. The website will link to the Vermont 2-1-1 resource database via an online portal connection, offer developmental and parenting resources, and link other national resources - including resources that support young children's social emotional competence. Our social media campaign is underway via Facebook and we plan to add Instagram and a YouTube channel. And our 2-1-1 *HMG VT* mobile app is currently under development.

### *HMG Vermont Family & Community Outreach*

The *HMG Vermont Contact Center* early childhood resource database was significantly expanded, and is currently being kept up-to-date in real time thanks to our Community Outreach partnership with Building Bright Futures (BBF) State and Regional Councils. Leveraging existing BBF networking activities and community and family outreach events, the BBF Regional Coordinators play a vital system role by providing real-time, on the



ground, information about communities and resources that directly inform the Vermont 2-1-1 resource and referral system. Vermont 2-1-1 staff now attend BBF Regional Council meetings (at least quarterly), to foster this ongoing information exchange. This information exchange is bi-directional: the HMG Contact Center data and reporting, which includes information on gaps and barriers, helps inform both the regional and state BBF councils in their work for effective advocacy and system change.

Four BBF Regional Councils have been selected as *HMG* VT Family and Community Outreach initial pilot sites to implement innovative outreach strategies: Bennington, Caledonia/Southern Essex, Lamoille Valley and Orleans/Northern Essex. Key outreach strategies utilized to promote the use of *HMG* VT will be scaled up and spread to the remaining 8 BBF regions beginning July 1, 2017. A tracking system has been developed for the 4 BBF pilot sites to report on activities and impact indicators, such as the number of children and families reached, and number of children receiving screening via community outreach public events. This reporting system will be used by all BBF regions beginning July 1, 2017 to demonstrate statewide impact of outreach activities.

#### *HMG* VT Child Health and Education Provider Outreach

The Vermont Child Health Improvement Program (VCHIP) conducts training and on-site coaching to both child health providers and early care and learning providers on developmental monitoring, screening, and linkage to *HMG* VT.

- 1) In partnership with Vermont Birth to Five, a project of the Permanent Fund for Vermont's Children, VCHIP has expanded developmental screening training from the health sector to early care and education (ECE) professionals across the state. The VCHIP quality improvement training, outreach and intensive coaching includes:
  - Training in developmental monitoring and how to talk with parents about concerns using CDC's "Learn the Signs. Act Early." program resources.
  - Training and help implementing developmental screening using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and the ASQ: Social and Emotional (ASQ:SE).
  - Educating about the *HMG* VT Contact Center to link both providers and families to needed resources and referrals, as well as for ongoing care coordination and connection to a child's health care provider.

Find more information on our public health dashboard at: [http://healthvermont.gov/hv2020/dashboard/childhood\\_screening.aspx](http://healthvermont.gov/hv2020/dashboard/childhood_screening.aspx).

- 2) Primary Care Practices receive developmental screening quality improvement training via the Child Health Advances Measured in Practice (CHAMP) Network. This year 49 primary care practices participated in quality improvement training in developmental screening via CHAMP.
- 3) VCHIP provides training on use of the Vermont Department of Health's new Universal Developmental Screening (UDS) Registry --a comprehensive, statewide screening data collection and communication system. Four primary care practice sites have signed on for training in use of the Registry - and training is underway in the Lamoille region with Appleseed Pediatrics and Lamoille Valley early care and education professionals.
- 4) Selected to be part of a second Strengthening Families Protective Factors pilot, supported by the JPB Foundation, *HMG* National Center and the Center for the Study of Social Policy, *HMG* VT staff are working with pediatricians on mitigating the impact of toxic stress and ways to help families reduce it. Work has begun in partnership with pediatricians at the University of Vermont Medical Center and Pediatric New American Clinic.

#### *HMG* VT Data Collection and Analysis:

The Vermont Child Health Improvement Program (VCHIP) together with Vermont's Universal Developmental Screening (UDS) Registry provide data collection and analysis. Part of our Health Department immunization

registry, the UDS Registry provides a statewide data collection system for developmental screening results. Screening results for multiple tools are included: The Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Third Edition (ASQ - 3), Ages and Stages Questionnaire-Social Emotional (ASQ:SE), and the Modified Checklist for Autism in Toddlers (M-CHAT). The Registry screening collection system offers reporting features for primary care providers including: a screening history report, screening follow up status, children due for screening (per the American Academy of Pediatrics Bright Futures Periodicity schedule), and screening rates report. The intent is for primary care providers to use the registry features to help them improve developmental screening rates overall for children in their practice and to utilize the data to get credit for improved screening rates (under the Vermont Blueprint for Health Care Reform). VCHIP provides our annual *HMG VT* evaluation which includes data and results from qualitative studies to assess both families' and stakeholders' perceptions of and experiences with *the HMG VT* system. Data is collected on all aspects of the *HMG VT* system to:

- identify gaps and barriers
- promote continuous quality improvement across all components of the *HMG VT* system
- promote the importance of early detection and intervention for all children's well-being
- provide comprehensive reporting linked to outcomes, outputs and service activities

Data highlights from 2016 include:

- To date, 461 ECE professionals have been trained in developmental screening and conducted over 1600 screens on children in their care.
- We received 666 (incoming) calls to the *HMG VT* Child Development Specialists who made 504 (outgoing/follow up) calls and 827 referrals on behalf of families. We served 226 children (unduplicated count) via telephone care coordination. For more data/results, please see our *HMG Vermont RBA* report card posted on our Early Learning Challenge grant website at [http://buildingbrightfutures.org/elc\\_grant/outcomes/](http://buildingbrightfutures.org/elc_grant/outcomes/).

#### *HMG VT* System Innovations

We have expanded our pilot of the innovative Mid-Level Developmental Assessment (MLDA) model this year. MLDA is a feasible and effective, evidence-based model for the timely assessment of children ages 0-6 years suspected of developmental delay based on surveillance and screening. Through the assessment, children with mild/moderate developmental and behavioral concerns are efficiently linked to programs and services, while facilitated access is coordinated for children with more severe delays to additional comprehensive assessment and services. Several Early Childhood Special Education programs in two Supervisory Unions are using the MLDA model to support quality improvements and efficiencies in their current screening and assessment protocols.

53 total children have received a Mid-Level Developmental Assessment (MLDA) in partnership with several Early Childhood Special Education programs in 2 Supervisory Unions (find more information below under Innovations). Of these children referred to MLDA (who exhibit mild to moderate concerns), 33 did not need further tertiary level evaluation.

#### **CHILD CARE CONSULTATION AND TRAINING**

During 2016, the Child Care Wellness Consultants (CCWC) continued to make consulting visits to child care programs across the state who are participating in STARS. Data about these visits are currently being collected and analyzed (and will be available later this month). CCWC RNs continued working in their individual communities to promote the use of the program and, as a result, have seen an explosion in interest in the Medication Administration trainings. The CCWC RNs continue to use regional partners, including the BBF Regional Coordinators and Starting Points Network leaders, to promote their services. The current changes to the early childhood professional development system as part of a Transforming the Workforce effort (for more see narrative D2) have created some challenges in delivery of our program - primarily, because the Vermont Association of Child Care Resource and Referral agency (VACCRA) Resource Development Specialists were integral to the smooth implementation of trainings and creating relationships in the regions.

Preliminary data shows that CCWCs have conducted 41 Medication Administration Trainings, ensuring more than 750 child care providers are training in safe medication administration. Several trainings have been scheduled for 2017 and we are working closely with the Child Development Division and local agencies and

organizations to strategically set up an array of health and safety focused trainings throughout 2017. The on-line medication administration training modules, required to attend the in-person workshops and housed on the Northern Lights Career Development Center, were updated and we are in the process of creating a review module for Medication Administration. The CCWCs also conducted 8 specialized trainings for more than 45 child care providers including Ask the Nurse, Emergency Response Planning, Managing Infectious Diseases, and others. These trainings can be offered in concert with the CCWC consulting visits to provide specialized and personalized instruction in health and safety topics. The Child Care Wellness Consultant team intranet site has been updated regularly to ensure the team delivers consistent evidence-based approaches to health and safety concerns. Monthly team conference calls offer the nurses a chance to discuss best practices for visits and trainings, any challenges they are experiencing, and an opportunity to build collegial relationships - a particular challenge with a program that is so geographically separated.

In the summer of 2016, CCWC Coordinator, Rosemaryl Harple, retired from her position and the program was overseen by Laura Bernard while a new coordinator was hired. In November of 2016, Becky Millard (formerly Becky Raymond) was hired as the Infant and Child Health Coordinator with the Maternal and Child Health Division and, over the last month of 2016, began taking on responsibility for this program. Her two primary focuses in the coming year will be broad marketing of the CCWC services across the early childhood system, and strategic planning around efficiency and integration opportunities for the CCWC program as we look to the future. The CCWC coordinator is now housed two days per week in the Waterbury State Office Complex, allowing for efficient and effective collaboration with the Child Development Division and many other state partners. Becky's long time membership as part of the leadership team for the Building Bright Futures Professional Preparation and Development committee is an asset to more effectively integrating this program into the professional development system. Becky will also be attending the STARS Oversight committee and seeks this as an opportunity to look holistically at ways health and safety are integrated into the system.

In addition to the plans listed above, other 2017 goals include working to ensure CCWC consulting visits are happening across all areas of the state, with particular focus on the harder to reach areas. With intentional effort toward sustainability, we will be training the *Help Me Grow* Early Childhood Specialists at Vermont 2-1-1, not only on the process for referring interested child care programs to RN consultants for visits, but also on referrals for Medication Administration Trainings as well.

### **PROMOTING EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT THROUGH EARLY MULTI-TIERED SYSTEMS OF SUPPORTS**

The Early Multi-Tiered System of Supports (Early MTSS) approach supports the social, emotional, and learning needs of all children, inclusive of children with high needs and disabilities in early care and education settings.

Early MTSS utilizes the Pyramid Model for Supporting Social and Emotional Competence in Infants and Young Children as a conceptual framework of evidence-based practices including promotion, prevention and intervention. The Pyramid Model was developed by two national, federally-funded research and training centers: The Center for the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) and Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention for Young Children (TACSEI).

#### Program Sites:

In July 2016, the Early MTSS review committee approved ten new Early MTSS sites for cohort 3. These early childhood programs provided evidence of readiness through the Early MTSS application process. Applications were examined by a state review team. On-site interviews with site administrators and staff were conducted. Classroom observations were completed. To assure consistency with quality standards, one of the criteria for local early childhood programs to become an Early MTSS cohort site is: "Maintain 4/5 STARS or NAEYC accreditation standards as required by Vermont's quality recognition system for registered family child care providers and/or licensed early childhood programs (including Head Start and Act 166 (public preK prequalified programs)." All Cohort sites were intentionally selected from locations across the state. They include:

#### Cohort 3 Sites (July, 2016):

- Bennington County Head Start, Bennington, VT
- Integrated Arts Academy - Burlington School District, Burlington, VT
- Caring Community Preschool, Post Mills, VT

- Charlotte Children's Center, Charlotte, VT
- Concord School - Essex Caledonia Supervisory Program Early Education, Concord, VT
- Eden Central School - Lamoille North Supervisory Union, Hyde Park, VT
- Family Center of Washington County, Montpelier, VT
- Learning Adventure, South Hero, VT
- Mountain Village School, Stowe VT
- The Winston Prouty Center for Child Development, Brattleboro, VT

Cohort 2 Sites (July, 2015):

- Caledonia Central Barnet School, Barnet, VT
- Shelburne Community School Preschool, Shelburne, VT
- Starksboro Cooperative Preschool, Starksboro, VT
- Windsor Southeast State Street PreK Program, Windsor VT

Early MTSS cohorts 1 through 3 combined now include 22 sites in ten regions. In addition, two programs are implementing the Pyramid Model to fidelity program-wide, which increases the number of children and families served across classrooms, towns, or districts.

#### Family Involvement:

RTT ELC supports Early MTSS to involve families at various levels.

- In 2016, sites agreed to Early MTSS expectations that include providing ongoing communication with families. Early MTSS programs are expected to inform families of the Early MTSS efforts, share Pyramid Model parenting materials, and involve families in their Leadership Teams. Many of the family materials have been matched to classroom training themes and, as a result, families and teachers can be supporting children in similar ways, using similar language and strategies.
- In October, a consultant from Pyramid Model Consortium conducted a Train the Trainer on the Pyramid Model's *Positive Solutions for Families*. In addition, a Community of Practice for participants was begun as a way to provide ongoing support. To date, 2 programs have begun the *Positive Solutions for Families* series and 3 programs are in planning stages. Eventually, all Early MTSS programs will offer this series to their families.

#### Data:

In December 2016, the Agency of Education released data from the first two cohorts of Early MTSS sites. The data measures how well the programs are implementing the model as well as the resulting impact on children's social and emotional development. One of the key measures is the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT), which measures how well teachers are promoting healthy social and emotional development through their classroom practices. In 2016, 7 of 8 cohort site teachers scored at least a 79%, indicating that they were implementing the Pyramid Model with a high degree of fidelity. Six of these sites scored over 90% fidelity. One of the new sites scored 72% on their post-TPOT score indicating they were close to achieving fidelity in Pyramid teaching practices.

The Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS) is used to measure the project's impact on children's social skills and challenging behaviors. Sites collected pre and post teacher-reported data on the occurrence of social skills and challenging behaviors in the classroom on a four-point scale, with 4 being *Almost Always*, 3 being *Often*, 2 being *Seldom*, and 1 being *Never*. In 2016, 6 of 8 sites showed growth in children's use of social skills between pre- and post-assessment; 6 sites indicated children used positive social skills 'often' (at or over 2.99) while the remaining 2 programs showed that children's use of positive skills was close to 'often' (2.78 and 2.91). Finally, 6 of 8 sites saw decreases in children's challenging behaviors; by spring, all sites indicated that challenging behaviors occurred between 1 (Never) and 2 (Seldom).

### Regional Scale-Up and Sustainability:

RTT ELC funds support the scale up and sustainability efforts of Early MTSS that has been supported since 2008 through the State Personnel Development (USDOE SPDG #3 and SPDG #4). To ensure implementation fidelity and sustainability of evidence based practices supporting young children's social and emotional competence and well-being, we conducted a series of meetings at the state, regional and local levels to build the capacity for leadership and organizational systems design in Early MTSS.

In addition, in 2015, Early MTSS project leadership worked on building a close relationship with the Building Bright Futures (BBF) state leadership in order to develop a shared understanding and readiness to adopt and implement Early MTSS and its processes in each of Vermont's 12 Building Bright Futures Councils.

In 2016, 4 BBF Regional Councils were chosen as part of the first regional Cohort. Four regions were chosen to represent geographic diversity across the state: Franklin/Grand Isle, Addison, Orleans-Northern Essex and Springfield Vermont. To date:

- Early MTSS external coaches/facilitators were identified to help guide Regional Leadership Teams to develop policies, procedures, and other mechanisms needed to implement, evaluate, and sustain the Pyramid Model and practices with fidelity.
- Regional Leadership Teams have completed the Early MTSS Regional Systems Inventory, a self-assessment tool that helps regions organize, plan and monitor their progress on Early MTSS implementation and sustainability efforts.
- Regional teams have developed their vision statements and have begun to implement their Action Plans.
- All Early MTSS sites are expected to participate in their local BBF Regional Council to further collaboration and coordination of Early MTSS efforts.

### Early MTSS Collaboration:

Early MTSS collaborates with and supports several other projects within ELC to further improve child outcomes.

Early MTSS trainers and coaches are recognized in Mentoring Advising Teaching Coaching Consulting Helping (M.A.T.C.H.) (Project 15) Professional Development system. ELC Early MTSS and M.A.T.C.H. are working together to provide the necessary connections to recognize trainer/coach/consultant qualifications, competencies and practice across early childhood PD sectors. M.A.T.C.H. is undergoing an evaluation to improve its system via ELC.

Early MTSS also aligns with Help Me Grow (Project 12), and project leads meet regularly to share resources and more closely reinforce each other's efforts. HMG provides the first open door for young children and their families through its 2-1-1 help line; Early MTSS then provides needed supports and practices for early childhood practitioners and families to better meet the needs of all children, especially those at risk or with disabilities. During 2016:

- Early MTSS and HMG participated in 2 joint training opportunities with the goal of increasing family and practitioner awareness and use of available resources. In April, Early MTSS and HMG presented at the Vermont Family Network's annual conference to families, Part C Early Interventionists and early childhood teachers. In December, a day long training facilitated by the Vermont Child Health Improvement Program (VCHIP) around social and emotional development was held with approximately 75 practitioners in attendance. Training included the Ages and Stages - Social/Emotional screening tool and Pyramid Model environmental practices to enhance early learning classrooms.
- Early MTSS has identified resources and materials to support HMG early childhood specialists who answer calls on the 2-1-1 help line. In addition, Early MTSS is supporting a consultant from the Pyramid Model Consortium to write family-friendly descriptions for the social/emotional page on their new website and to develop or identify family/caregiver friendly content for HMG's social media campaign.

Early MTSS also works closely with Project 10, Comprehensive Assessment. Early MTSS collects child progress data, teacher implementation data, and program-wide and regional systems data through a variety of measures, including Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ), The Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT), Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS), the Early MTSS Program Inventory (systems tool) and the Early MTSS Regional

Inventory. These efforts align with, and are supported by, the Comprehensive Assessment work.

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

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

<b>Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.</b>					
<b>Baseline and Annual Targets</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Number of Children with High Needs screened</b>	12,660	13,326	13,770	14,214	14,659
<b>Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment</b>	7,596	7,976	8,375	8,794	9,234
<b>Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care</b>	19,878	19,878	20,211	20,655	20,877
<b>Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care</b>	0.72	0.75	0.78	0.8	0.82

<b>Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.</b>					
<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Number of Children with High Needs screened</b>	12,660	12,789	15,664	15,317	
<b>Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment</b>	7,596	7,417	7,519	7,352	
<b>Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care</b>	19,878	18,923	19,872	16,995	
<b>Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care</b>	0.72	0.76	0.74	0.7	

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

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

Year 3 data is from 2015 calendar year. We use chart review data from a longitudinal quality improvement project and Medicaid claims data to report the number of children screened.

We use the longitudinal quality improvement project chart review for the number of children referred who receive follow up/treatment.

We use Medicaid claims data for the percentage of children who participate in ongoing healthcare and also who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care.

We are working toward actual developmental screening rates being available through a statewide data repository (building on our immunization registry). We received legislative authority to collect developmental screening data in June 2016 and have 4 practices piloting the registries use in 2017.

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

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

In Year 3, Vermont sustained the progress made in increasing the number of children with high needs who receive developmental screenings within their medical home, after a major jump in Year 2. With 15,317 children screened this year, we exceeded our Year 3 and 4 targets.

However, it appears that we have not made progress or met our targets in the number of children referred for services who receive follow up treatment. This data is collected as part of our quality improvement work at the Vermont Child Health Improvement Program, which asks providers what they do with positive screens for developmental concerns. 30% currently say they monitor, which may explain why the number of children receiving follow up services/treatment is not increasing.

Similarly, we saw a significant drop in our overall well child care in Year 3. This is due to a decrease in Medicaid claims for the 0-15 months well child check ups. To determine if this drop is actual or a function of something in the data collection, we compared this Medicaid claims data (our traditional data source) to our longitudinal quality improvement project, Vermont Child Health Improvement Program (VCHIP). This data source shows higher rates than the claims data. A team from Medicaid, American Academy of Pediatrics and VCHIP are investigating this drop to determine possible causes. We will update these numbers if need be, as more information becomes available in the months to come.

We believe the lack of progress in our data about children referred to services who receive follow treatment is more a reflection of how we are measuring ( through chart review in our statewide quality improvement project) and not about the actual follow up for VT's families. Vt-Help Me Grow will continue to grow as a more reliable source of referral and follow up data for the children who screen positive for developmental concerns.

We also know that connection to service is a benchmark in our home visiting work and Help Me Grow which is encouraging providers to go beyond monitoring even for children who do not qualify for traditional developmental services like Early Intervention.



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

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

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

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

***VERMONT DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA C(4) IN THEIR  
RTT-ELC APPLICATION***

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

(Section D(1) of Application)

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

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

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

***VERMONT DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA D(1) IN THEIR  
RTT-ELC APPLICATION***

## 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.

Vermont's Early Learning Challenge grant has supported increasing professional development for early childhood professionals in a variety of ways.

### **INCREASING CAPACITY OF LICENSED PREK TEACHERS**

Mandatory implementation at Act 166, Vermont's Universal PreK law, began in the fall of 2016. The success of Act 166, relies, in large part, on having enough qualified programs delivering PreK services in a variety of settings to serve all of Vermont's 3, 4, and 5 year olds not yet in kindergarten. Many high-quality programs are interested in providing Pre-K, but don't qualify because they don't employ a licensed early education teacher.

In February 2015, an ad hoc group work group, with leadership from the Early Learning Challenge grant, convened to discuss the anticipated shortage of licensed PreK teachers required in publicly funded PreK programs. The group worked to understand the pathways to licensure/ endorsement, identify barriers, and describe possible solutions. The meetings included representation from the Agency of Education, the Agency of Human Services, the higher education community, and the philanthropic community.

In the spring of 2016, the ad hoc PreK Teacher Capacity Work Group distributed an informal survey to all 3, 4

and 5 STAR programs, to ask both school and community-based child care providers whether they experience difficulty finding appropriately licensed teachers. The informal survey went out to 620 three, four, and five STAR programs. 212 center and home-based programs and 70 school-based programs responded, a 45% response rate. Key takeaways from the results include:

- **Recruiting and hiring licensed Pre-K Teachers is challenging, especially for home and center-based programs:**
  - Of 244 programs who responded to the question “Please rate the level of difficulty in recruiting or hiring a licensed Pre-K Teacher,” 191, or 78%, found the process “difficult” or “very difficult”.
  - Of the 60 school-based programs responding to the question, 45% found the process “difficult” or “very difficult”.
  - Of the 184 home and center-based programs responding to the question, 89% found the process “difficult” or “very difficult”.
  - The process is most difficult for home and center-based programs outside of Chittenden County. Of 138 who responded, 50% described the process as “very difficult.”
- **Not being able to provide adequate wages and benefits poses the biggest hiring challenge for home and center-based programs:** 114 programs responded to a question asking about specific challenges faced in recruiting and hiring licensed Pre-K teachers:
  - 76 home and center-based programs reported not being able to pay the desired salary of a licensed teacher; 32 reported not being able to find a qualified teacher interested in working in their program.
  - 3 school-based programs reported not being able to pay the desired salary of a licensed teacher; 3 reported not being able to find qualified teacher interested in working in their program
  - Other challenges listed by home and center-based programs include:
    - Some programs are supporting staff through provisional license/peer-review process, but find it challenging and expensive (11 comments).
    - Several programs report that licensed teachers don't necessarily meet program needs, have the right skills, or align with program philosophy (9 comments).
    - Some programs can match school pay, but have a hard time hiring because they are asking teachers to work more days/hours than school-based teachers (5 comments).

The survey shows that the ripple effects of Act 166 will continue to change the early childhood world in VT. The PreK Teacher Capacity work group, in coordination with the Higher Ed work group, will continue to work on addressing these issues. In the meantime, several statewide efforts and resources help address challenges related to availability of licensed Pre-K Teachers:

- The Agency of Education, Vermont Birth to Five, and Vermont's T.E.A.C.H. scholarship programs partnered to create a process for approximately 40 individuals (over two years) to be awarded provisional licensure, and are providing mentoring and financial support in order to help those individuals attain a VT Level 1 teaching license with ECE or ECSE endorsement. As of December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016, 5 have achieved ECE licensure and are continuing to work in community-based programs, 2 have submitted peer review portfolios and are awaiting review, and 10 are on track to submit portfolios by January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017. We anticipate a similar number completing this process during 2017.
- Dr. Eden Haywood-Bird, assistant professor in early elementary education at Lyndon State College, developed a new Early Childhood Education Licensure program that helps move those with an associate's degree to a bachelor's degree with licensure, and those with a bachelor's degree to licensure. This program is mostly online, so it greatly increases access for early childhood professionals throughout the state. In addition, the requirement for student teaching can be met in the place of

employment, with approved supervision. For more information, visit: <http://λψνδονστατε.εδυ/δεγρεε-προγραμμασ/εδυχατιον/εαρλψ-χηλδηροοδ-εδυχατιον/>

- The Vermont Standards Board has undertaken several efforts in the last few years that may be helpful to those seeking licensure with an ECE or ECSE endorsement:
  - Signed the Interstate National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification “license to license” agreement which means that any educator with a non-conditional/non-expired out of state educator license, from a state that has also signed the agreement, is eligible for initial licensure in VT to match the same/equivalent endorsement from the other state.
  - Revised the competencies required to become licensed with ECE or ECSE endorsement. The new competencies were developed with significant guidance from the NAEYC teaching standards and others. These are the standards that will now be used for transcript review and peer review, which should significantly streamline the process.
  - Scheduled all 2017 Peer Review clinics on Saturdays.

### **COORDINATION WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

The Early Childhood Higher Ed Group, supported by the ELC grant, met eleven times as a full group in 2016, under the leadership of Dr. Cheryl Mitchell, a highly-respected educator, longstanding early childhood advocate, and former deputy secretary of the Agency of Human Services. The group includes representatives from institutions of higher education that provide coursework in early childhood education: University of Vermont, Castleton University, Union Institute and University, Vermont State Colleges, Lyndon State College, Community College of Vermont, Springfield College, Goddard College, and College of St. Joseph's. Representatives from supporting organizations, those that regulate licenses and credentials, fund coursework or deliver content, also participate. The group meets quarterly with Deans and Education Coordinators. Active subgroups include those mapping availability of coursework, sources of financial support, articulation agreements, and planning for a summer institute. Work from these sub committees is posted on the Northern Lights website, once it is completed. There is a high level of enthusiasm among participants, and a firm belief that substantial improvement in aligning coursework and increasing access for non-traditional students is now well underway.

The Early Childhood Higher Ed Group is also monitoring the progress of the newly launched program at Lyndon State College which meets the needs of many early childhood professionals who have a AA degree in ECE already and are looking for a pathway to a BS degree with licensure. The program began in fall 2016 and offers a series of 5-week online courses, with face-to-face meetings at the start of each term. Students with an AA would be able to finish the program in five semesters. Students in the first cohort have come from many settings and regions of the state. The second cohort opens for enrollment in the spring of 2017.

The Early Childhood Higher Ed group is also organizing a summer institute planned for July 2017 which will offer ten intensive courses from most of the participating institutions of higher education. The Early Childhood Higher Education work group will build on this institute as a way of further aligning coursework across the state and potential offering a more streamlined pathway to licensure.

### **ADOPTION OF T.E.A.C.H.**

Since launching in March 2014, T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® VERMONT has helped 88 early education professionals increase their education through our Associate Scholarship Model. Recipients working to obtain their AA degree in Early Childhood Education through the Community College of Vermont completed an average of 12 credits per contract have taken a total of 939 credits to date. Fourteen T.E.A.C.H. Scholarship recipients have received their associate's degree. The average grade point average for a T.E.A.C.H. recipient working on their associate degree was 3.7. The average hourly wage of a teacher on a T.E.A.C.H. scholarship was \$12.06 and those recipients who completed their degrees during this time increased their earnings by \$.10 per hour. Of our recipients, 22 worked with 3-5 year old children, 30 worked with children under 2, 30 were Family Childcare and worked with 0-schoolage children, and 5 were Directors of center-based programs. In a survey of T.E.A.C.H. recipients, 92% indicated they would recommend T.E.A.C.H. to their peers; and 100% of their employers would recommend T.E.A.C.H.

In 2016, T.E.A.C.H. continued a partnership with the Vermont Agency of Education for a scholarship model to

help early education professionals obtain either their Early Childhood Education or Early Childhood Special Education endorsements. Funding for this was re-allocated to T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® VERMONT from another workforce-related ELC project after receiving federal approval. The scholarships support educators who currently hold a **provisional license** and are working to obtain full licensure. Vermont Birth to 5 is another critical partner in the effort, providing mentoring services to help the provisional licensees through the process of obtaining their endorsement. In the past year 23 recipients were awarded scholarships. To date, 6 have obtained their licenses and 11 other have applied for their licenses and are waiting to hear from the Vermont Agency of Education.

In August 2016, T.E.A.C.H. began a **Non-Provisional License Model** to help early education professionals obtain either their Early Childhood Education or Early Childhood Special Education endorsements and to obtain full licensure. In the past 5 months, 11 recipients have received their first contract. Seven recipients are taking Higher Education courses through the VT Higher Ed. Collaborative at Lyndon State College, 3 are working on the Peer Review process and 1 is working on the Transcript Review process.

VAEYC has been working on sustainability efforts during 2016. This began with initial fund request meetings with Vermont's 3 major philanthropic funders (Henderson, Turrell and the Permanent Fund) in the winter of 2016. Given that philanthropic funders were waiting for state investment, in the summer of 2016 VAEYC started to work with the Vermont Early Childhood Alliance and the Child Development Division to create a legislative proposal that would support sustainability and growth for T.E.A.C.H. The plan to ask for \$960,000 for 50 AA recipients, 50 BA recipients and 20 Licensure recipients was approved by the Alliance's Steering Committee in November 2016. The Child Development Division agreed to be the "host agency" for public funds in December 2016. The VAEYC board has been doing outreach to legislators and educating and rallying others to contact their legislators about T.E.A.C.H. funding throughout December 2016 and into January of 2017.

Moving forward, outreach to legislators will continue. A legislative champion needs to be found to spearhead a bill and VAEYC must work closely with Let's Grow Kids to tie the T.E.A.C.H. funding ask to the Blue Ribbon Commission Report, and with the Child Development Division and RTT Implementation Team around possible 5<sup>th</sup> year funding. In addition to efforts to secure public funds, in mid-February VAEYC will submit a Letter of Interest for the Innovation and Collaboration Grant from VT Community Foundation. The intent is to be invited to submit a proposal.

VAEYC also intends to submit a "Workforce Investment" grant proposal to Department of Labor in March of 2017 for \$50,000 to support the TEACH licensure model for 20 recipients.

#### **ADDITION OF COLLEGE COURSES - VCCICC**

In 2016, 317 early childhood professionals attended VCCICC sponsored classes. 226 of these students attended the courses funded through the ELC grant. Apprenticeship has increased 24% with ELC funding.

The Vermont Child Care Industry and Career Council, Inc. (VCCICC) has used the support of the ELC grant to expand the availability of a series of six 3-credit college courses that are required of the Vermont Child Care Apprenticeship Program and are foundational for all early care professionals. Six additional ELC-funded course cycles have been added over the past 2 years to the three already supported through VCCICC and other sources. Additionally, capacity to promote the courses and the Apprenticeship Program and facilitate registration for both is enhanced with ELC funding.

VCCICC and the VT Department of Labor collaborate to offer the Apprenticeship Program for child care workers seeking education and experience in the field. Apprentices document 4,000 hours of supervised on-the-job training; complete the sequence of six tuition-free college courses; and participate in additional community based trainings to gain the knowledge and skills needed to work more effectively in the field.

Delivery of the new ELC funded courses began in 2015, with two locations. Classes at these two sites were offered as hybrid courses which blend on-line learning with four face-to-face meetings. The VT Child Care Industry and Careers Council (VCCICC) used this strategy, with limited success to increase the catchment areas of students who may access the learning opportunities. The remaining four cycles were held in typical face-to-face fashion, to better support the needs of the student base. Two cycles remain in process and will end in December 2017.

We have conducted outreach for new apprentices in one of the original sites. The interest in this catchment area is greater than our capacity to provide support and the needed college courses. This cycle of classes, to

begin in January 2017, will be funded through grant writing and community donations. Outreach to a second site will begin once seed money for classes is received. VCCICC will work with the local Building Bright Futures Council and the participating employers to solicit funding from local businesses to support the cost of college courses in their regions.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF M.A.T.C.H.**

The M.A.T.C.H. project (Mentoring, Advising, Coaching, Consulting and Helping) creates a registry of professionals who provide on-site training, one on one mentoring, and relationship-based professional development to the early childhood workforce. Relationship-based professional development has proved particularly effective for early childhood professionals in getting the skills and training they need to provide high quality care and education for children.

Eleven MATCH training modules (The Art of MATCH: Skillful mentoring and coaching) for MATCH professionals have been completed, materials prepared, and qualified instructors trained and identified. The new modules will begin in February 2017, once a month for 11 months. They are designed for working mentors, coaches and consultants who support early childhood and afterschool professionals/programs. Development and implementation of these trainings are part of the MATCH strategic plan. The MATCH registry continues its development and the MATCH sponsor agreement has been revised. This Agreement will be used to connect organizations that sponsor mentors or coaches, to connect to the MATCH Registry. The MATCH committee continues to meet monthly to design and advise the implementation of the MATCH design components.

The Grant funded an evaluation design plan that informs all aspects of the implementation of MATCH. Questions from the MATCH evaluation plan are integrated into the evaluation of the Art of MATCH modules, in data that will be drawn from the MATCH Registry to help evaluate the system and in the agreements with the instructors, and the sponsors of MATCH activities. The data collected from these sources will be used to answer the questions in the evaluation plan and to continue to make changes in the system to be comprehensive, responsive, and effective.

### **WORKFORCE STUDY**

The Workforce Study was completed in 2015, and was detailed in that report. The final survey report is now available on the Child Development Division website at:

<http://dcf.vermont.gov/cdd/reports>

The results of the Workforce Study have been used to inform key VT policy work. For example, A Blue Ribbon Commission was established by the Vermont Legislature in 2015 to produce a report on the high cost of high quality child care, affordability and accessibility. Information from the results of the Workforce Survey was reviewed during this process and integrated into the Blue Ribbon Commission's Final Report in 2016.

In 2016, Cope and Associates were contracted to help the Child Development Division conduct outreach with the child care community on submitting qualifications and professional development information to the Northern Lights Career Development Center for verification and uploading into the VT Bright Futures Information System (BFIS). The goal of the project is to increase the data in BFIS by 20%.

### **TRANSFORMING THE WORKFORCE**

In Vermont's CCDF State Plan for 2016 - 2018, CDD set a goal to launch a transformed system of training and professional development for early childhood professionals beginning in January 2017. Although not a project of the Early Learning Challenge grant, this effort is informed by grant workforce efforts and builds on the grant's goal of developing stronger systems. In working toward the goal, in 2016 CDD convened an ad hoc workgroup to examine research into best practice and make recommendations regarding essential and desired elements of an effective delivery system in Vermont. The group included professionals working in family child care homes and centers and other stakeholders. This envisioning group worked over two months and delivered recommendations to CDD in late April.

Over the summer and fall, CDD engaged in a competitive process for Initial Funding for the Vermont Early Childhood Professional Development System (VT ECPDS). CDD received one application with a Lead Applicant and several identified partners. Beginning January 1, 2017, the Community College of Vermont was awarded a grant and has begun developing and implementing the new VT ECPDS. However, given the amount of change involved, an interim plan has been put in place for the first year. CCV will operate the centralized functions of

the system, and the Permanent Fund/ Vermont Birth to Five will implement the regional training and technical assistance functions that are also essential to the infrastructure of the system. While we are in a period of transition now, the goal is for the new system to align with and incorporate established standards for programs and professionals in Vermont.



**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>	23	25	27	28	28
<b>Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider</b>	783	1,150	1,700	2,600	3,600

**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>	23	23	23	24	
<b>Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider</b>	783	1,078	1,500	1,634	

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

There is not yet a comprehensive system set up that tracks the numbers of **all** early childhood educators and early childhood special educators who receive credentials and degrees. The AOE licensing system includes all licenses but does not include other specific information such as where they work, how they got their license or type of credential or degree. BFIS, on the other hand, tracks credentials and degrees but doesn't include all licensed teachers; only those teachers who report their credentials to BFIS are counted through that system. There is currently no bridge between the two systems. We anticipate that the new child care licensing regulations, that went into effect on September 1, 2016, will help address this problem by requiring this information to be entered and verified in BFIS. Individuals have one year from the effective date of the regulations to be in full compliance. Data will be most complete after September 1, 2017.

Additional information on BFIS: We collect the above data through our BFIS system. This includes the total number of people who have received leveled certificates and/or degrees from institutions that are verified as aligned. This does not include people who have not submitted their information to BFIS. Institutions that award credentials and degrees include out of state institutions. The data from this table was generated through the BFIS annual reports, using what is current as of 12/31 of the reporting year.

(D)(2)(d)(1) – the count of individuals is a unique count of individuals who have verified credentials and degrees in our BFIS system who work directly with children.

The number of aligned institutions and providers comes from an informal information gathering effort prior to the grant application period. The increase in Year Three is based on a notable new degree and licensure program launched in 2016. We have not completed another survey of institutions and providers, though the Early Childhood Higher Ed group under project 16 has worked on mapping course work availability.

**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.

We fell significantly short of our target for the total number of early childhood professionals credentialed by an “aligned” institution or provider, with 1634 professionals credentialed, rather than 2600. Our targets were in part based on a belief that Vermont's child care licensing regulations would be in place earlier. Our hope is that our Year Four numbers, reflecting full compliance with the regulations, will better match our targets.

Our Early Childhood Higher Education Group has been working with deans and curriculum coordinators throughout the state to create greater access to degrees and licensure in institutions of higher education. In part as a result of conversations and support from this roundtable group, Lyndon State College launched a new Early Childhood Education Licensure program that helps move those with an associate's degree to a bachelor's degree with licensure, and those with a bachelor's degree to licensure. This program is mostly online, so it greatly increases access for early childhood professionals throughout the state. In addition, the requirement for student teaching can be met in the place of employment, with approved supervision.

**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>	118	2.7%	200	4.6%	400	9.2%	600	14%	750	17%
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level I Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 2</b>	203	4.7%	250	5.7%	400	9.2%	600	14%	800	18%
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level II Certificate or Child Development Associate (CDA)									
<b>Credential Type 3</b>	72	1.7%	250	5.7%	500	11%	800	18%	1,000	23%
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level IIIA Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 4</b>	87	2%	200	4.6%	400	9.2%	600	14%	850	19%
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level IIIB Certificate or Associate Degree									
<b>Credential Type 5</b>	151	3.5%	200	4.6%	400	9.2%	600	14%	850	19%
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level IVA Certificate or Bachelor Degree									
<b>Credential Type 6</b>	40	0.9%	200	4.6%	400	9.2%	600	14%	850	19%
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level IVB Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 7</b>	40	0.9%	45	1%	60	1.4%	75	1.7%	100	2.3%
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level VA Certificate or Master Degree									
<b>Credential Type 8</b>	10	0.2%	10	0.2%	15	0.3%	20	0.4%	50	1.1%
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level VB Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 9</b>	42	1%	50	1.1%	60	1.4%	70	1.6%	80	1.8%
<i>Specify:</i>	Apprenticeship Program Completed									
<b>Credential Type 10</b>	3	0.07%	10	0.2%	15	0.3%	25	0.6%	30	0.7%
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Family Mental Health Credential									
<b>Credential Type 11</b>	17	0.4%	26	0.6%	32	0.7%	53	1.2%	74	1.7%
<i>Specify:</i>	Program Director Credential - Step One									
<b>Credential Type 12</b>	1	0.02%	26	0.6%	51	1.2%	101	2.3%	151	3.5%
<i>Specify:</i>	Program Director Credential - Step Two									
<b>Credential Type 13</b>	2	0.05%	25	0.6%	50	1.2%	80	1.8%	100	2.3%
<i>Specify:</i>	Program Director Credential - Step Three									

**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>	118	2.7%	232	5.1%	280	5.97%	312	5.51%		
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level I Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 2</b>	203	4.7%	294	6.5%	327	6.97%	402	7.1%		
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level II Certificate or Child Development Associate (CDA)									
<b>Credential Type 3</b>	72	1.7%	119	2.6%	150	3.2%	166	2.93%		
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level IIIA Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 4</b>	87	2%	104	2.3%	116	2.47%	219	3.87%		
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level IIIB Certificate or Associate Degree									
<b>Credential Type 5</b>	151	3.5%	114	2.5%	137	2.92%	515	9.1%		
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level IVA Certificate or Bachelor Degree									
<b>Credential Type 6</b>	40	0.9%	66	1.5%	84	1.79%	99	1.75%		
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level IVB Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 7</b>	40	0.9%	18	0.4%	26	0.55%	145	2.56%		
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level VA Certificate or Master Degree									
<b>Credential Type 8</b>	10	0.2%	22	0.5%	29	0.6%	35	0.62%		
<i>Specify:</i>	VT Early Childhood Level VB Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 9</b>	42	1%	50	1.1%	60	1.28%	63	1.1%		
<i>Specify:</i>	Apprenticeship Program Completed									
<b>Credential Type 10</b>	3	0.07%	0	0%	4	0.09%	6	0.11%		
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Family Mental Health Credential									
<b>Credential Type 11</b>	17	0.4%	93	2%	111	2.36%	144	2.54%		
<i>Specify:</i>	Program Director Credential - Step One									
<b>Credential Type 12</b>	1	0.02%	34	0.8%	43	0.9%	54	0.95%		
<i>Specify:</i>	Program Director Credential - Step Two									
<b>Credential Type 13</b>	2	0.05%	16	0.4%	18	0.38%	18	0.32%		
<i>Specify:</i>	Program Director Credential - Step Three									

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

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

A detailed description of requirements at each level of Vermont's Early Childhood Career Ladder can be found at <http://northernlightscdc.org/career-pathways/early-childhood-pathways/>.

Data in this table represents the cumulative number of individuals at each credential level working in Early Learning and Development Programs, who work directly with children. A total of 5659 individuals were working directly with children as of 12/31/2016. Data is extracted from Vermont's Bright Futures Information System (BFIS) which is the state's workforce registry and is based on 5659 individuals.

It is important to remember when viewing this performance measure that we are reporting the total number of individuals with each certificate or credential, not the number of new certificates or credentials issued.

### **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.

Reviewing our targets for this performance measure, it is clear that we were highly ambitious in estimating the number of early childhood professionals at each credential level. We only met three of our targets for Year Three, but significantly closed the gap in many others. Notably, of the targets we did meet, we greatly exceeded our goal for the number of professionals with a Master's Degree and with a Program Director Credential - Step One.

For the second year in a row, we saw an increase in the number of professionals holding a credential at every level of the career ladder, which means that we are continue to make progress in developing our workforce.

More accurate reporting in BFIS as a result of the new child care licensing regulations likely led to significant jumps in the number of professionals at several key levels of the career ladder between Year 2 and Year 3:

- The number of individuals with a Level II Certificate or Child Development Associate (CDA) rose from 327 to 402
- The number of individuals with a Level IIIB Certificate or Associate Degree rose from 116 to 219
- The number of individuals with a Level IVA Certificate or Bachelor Degree rose from 137 to 515
- The number of individuals with a Level VA Certificate of Master Degree rose from 26 to 144

We are very excited to see these increases and look forward to even more accurate data after September 1, 2017, the effective date to be in compliance with the new regulations.

## 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.

Vermont's new Ready for Kindergarten! Survey (R4K!S) is a 34-item survey kindergarten teachers complete for each kindergartner in their class during the first 6-8 weeks of school. Responses are based on the teacher's observation of the child. The domains included in the R4K!S are:

- Social and Emotional Development
- Approaches to Learning
- Communication
- Cognitive Development - General Knowledge
- Physical Health and Development

The health and wellness indicators incorporated in the R4K!S are aligned with the new Head Start standards as well as the Bright Futures recommendations from the American Academy of Pediatrics.

In 2015, American Institutes for Research (AIR) completed an alignment between the R4K!S and the revised Vermont Early Learning Standards. AIR reported that the revised R4K!S and VELS had strong alignment of 91% of items and 81% of standards. AIR completed this alignment under their contract and there is no plan to do another at this point in time. This alignment was much improved compared with alignment between the unrevised KRS and the prior VELS in which only 50% of the standards aligned.

As previously reported, Vermont contracted with AIR during 2014 to complete a reliability and validity study of Vermont's old kindergarten readiness survey and make recommendations for improvement. The revised survey

was piloted the fall of 2014 and implemented statewide in the fall of 2015.

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

In August 2016, the Vermont Agency of Education (AOE) released the first statewide report on the new Ready for Kindergarten! Survey (R4K!S) for 2015-2016. In fall 2016, the second R4K!S was also conducted statewide and completed with a 92% response rate among kindergarten teachers. The FY17 report will be released spring 2017.

[The 2015-2016 R4K!S report](#) focused on the difference between the new survey and the old instrument, including changes in scoring methods, and the criteria used for identification of students as “ready.” It highlighted that the new survey also includes new and revised questions, including six in the Physical Development and Health domain.

The new R4K!S uses a “Total Score Approach,” which links a student's score to overall ability. A student is identified as “ready” if their overall, or “Total Score,” places them within the “Practicing” and “Performing Independently” range. In the previous years' kindergarten readiness survey (prior to FY15), a score of “beginning”, on any single item, disqualified a student from being identified as ready, without regard for the overall score.

The 2015-16 report and R4K!S Fast Facts communication stressed that the R4K!S should not be used to make comparisons between this years' R4K!S data and all previous years of KRS Survey data. Apparent differences in results are attributable to the use of a revised survey instrument and a new method to determine and define readiness, not to changes in the population of kindergarten students. Any comparisons made are considered invalid.

The 2015-2016 R4K!S was completed by Vermont kindergarten teachers with a 90.2% response rate. . The survey created a new baseline for readiness, with 81.79% of those surveyed considered “ready”. The report also broke down readiness by gender, eligibility for Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL), and participation in publicly funded PreK, and revealed readiness gaps in each category. However, the category, “Did Not Attend Prequalified Publicly Funded PreK” includes both students who attended preschool or childcare that was not publicly funded under Act 166 and those who did not attend any preschool or childcare at all. Because this statistic includes both groups, definitive conclusions cannot be made concerning the effect of PK attendance on readiness on the basis of these data.

#### Professional Learning

R4K!S training modules and resources were developed for the fall of 2015 and six regional trainings for kindergarten teachers were conducted around the state. In 2016, these training modules and resources were revised and created as e-learning modules on the AOE website for user friendly access. The R4K!S e-learning modules are currently being formatted to ensure 508 compliance and accessibility.

Vermont will continue to ensure that kindergarten teachers know how to accurately use the R4K!S, that they know its purpose, how to interpret and use the data, and that they understand formative assessment in general. In addition, we will continue to work closely with our private partners to ensure that R4K!S data is presented accurately to the wider public.

## 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.

There are four major components to this overall strategy:

- Data Governance
- SLDS and integration of early childhood datasets
- CIS data system development
- Vermont Insights

### **Data Governance:**

During 2016, major progress was made in establishing a system to support inter-agency data sharing and analysis. As a reminder, the data governance structure incorporates a hierarchical set of committees and workgroups, including a leadership team, the Data Governance Council (DGC), and designated data stewards workgroups as deemed necessary. The Data Governance Council is composed of data "owners" from the Agency of Education, the Health Department, the Department of Mental Health, the Child Development Division, the Agency of Human Services as well as a representative of the Governor's Office, the Early Learning Challenge grant, and Building Bright Futures. The data governance structure also includes external advisory committees. Representatives from the Department of Innovation and Information were added during 2016, in order to foster coordination between Agency-wide data governance work underway, and the DGC.

Accomplishments during 2016 for Early Childhood Data Governance system include:

- The Scope, Purpose, and Vision statements for the Data Governance Council were drafted, revised and adopted.
- A stakeholder meeting was well attended in September, 2016 with approximately 30 representatives of early care and education stakeholder groups.
- The Data Governance Manual was drafted, revised multiple times, and will be in the queue for adoption by the DGC at the January 2017 meeting, and to the external advisory groups for review before going to



Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Team (ECICT) for final approval.

- A proof case was decided upon and a working group established to outline a scope of work and timeline. This will be presented to the ECICT in the spring of 2017. The proof case seeks to determine the proportion of children accessing publicly funded PreK who come from low-income families, by using Medicaid data as the proxy for poverty. This will demonstrate how data sharing and analysis within the Data Governance structure can help produce actionable information related to early childhood in Vermont. It will test the governance process, while also demonstrating the value of the data governance process and promoting sustainable investment in the work.
- A working group called “Data Projects” met regularly to address coordination between the three major projects within the Early Learning Challenge grant that address system-level data issues --Project 19, Children's Integrated Services data system; Project 20, Vermont Insights, our public-facing data portal; and Project 22 integration of early childhood data sets into SLDS. This group has identified the data sets that will be imported into the SLDS, and has done a preliminary review of what is needed within each data set in order to import it. Data dictionaries have been collected and reviewed. This work will continue in the spring of 2017. The K-12 SLDS is slated for completion as of June 30, 2017, and then the integration of early childhood datasets can begin in earnest.
- As in 2015, the foundational work of building trust and understanding of one another's priorities between entities has been a major focus of discussion at Data Governance Council meetings.

### **SLDS and integration of early childhood datasets**

Because of major delays in completion of the K-12 SLDS, the AOE has not been able to begin integration of early childhood datasets into the SLDS. However, a summit meeting between the vendor and the AOE resulted in a new timeline and a much higher level of commitment and understanding of the project with the vendor. New leadership at the vendor made this possible. As a result, AOE has a high level of confidence that the K-12 SLDS will be completed by June 30, 2017, and that the integration of early childhood datasets will commence at that time.

### **CIS Data System**

Another major component of building and aligning our early childhood systems' data is developing the Children's Integrated Services data system. The CIS data system is being built in conjunction with work on Vermont's Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS).

In 2016, work began on Release 2 of the Medicaid Management Information System CARE system which will include the CIS data system. CIS subject matter experts have met with the system testers to help them understand CIS's business needs/process. The system testers are state staff who will initially test the changes in the system for CIS. The subject matter experts for CIS have begun the walk through of the contract requirements with the vendor to identify gaps and determine what will work in the “off the shelf” system, and what needs to be customized for CIS. Work has begun to review notes from the Joint Application Design sessions to confirm that the needs of CIS are well defined or if further clarification or discussions are needed.

Currently the vendor is in the process of conducting a “proof of concept.” The base product that the CIS system is built on does not support having more than one case/care manager on a case. In CIS there may be multiple providers who need to enter in goals and outcomes, summaries of evaluations, and case notes for a given case. The proof of concept work, which the vendor is doing at no cost to us, will see if they can build this into the current system to meet our needs. The deadline for completion of this work is Jan 31, 2017.

### **Vermont Insights**

#### **1. Key deliverable, Vermont Insights, launched**

Building Bright Futures successfully launched Vermont Insights in April 2016, the key deliverable of Early Learning Challenge grant project #20. Vermontinsights.org is an online resource, designed to share data on early childhood, families and communities. Data brought into Vermont Insights come from trusted sources. Results are put into an easy-to-understand format using Vermont Insights' free-to-the-public platform. It currently has a customer base of 1,300 Vermonters/data consumers spanning 84 cities and towns across the state.

Vermont Insights provides the public reporting data infrastructure for the Vermont's Early Childhood System,

publishing information that is timely, relevant, accessible, and easy for its stakeholders (policymakers, practitioners/administrators, and public) to use for continuous improvement and decision-making.

## **2. Sustainability of Vermont Insights is a priority for Vermont's Early Childhood System**

Key to sustainably is the integration of Vermont Insights in Building Bright Futures' organizational visioning and future development. With Early Learning Challenge grant funding ending for Vermont Insights in FY16, the BBF board approved a FY17 budget transitioning to one FTE staff. And, its Executive Director developed a business plan for sustainability with key stakeholders to be implemented in FY18-FY20. The plan includes a three-prong revenue model: 1. foundation and grant funding (20%), 2. donor investments (10%), and 3. earned Income - Tiered Pricing for Data Producers/Suppliers (70%). The financial model will be phased in over the next three years, FY18-FY20.

## **3. Supporting data use, two key contributions to Vermont's Early Childhood System**

The BBF-Vermont Insights team was a major contributor in supporting the use of data to inform policy, program and systems development on three key Building Bright Futures initiatives in 2016.

1. The Vermont Insights team provided data for the *How are Vermont's Young Children and Families?* 2016 report to be released January 11, 2017.
2. The Vermont Insights team, in collaboration with the Building Bright Futures Data and Evaluation Committee, will present its 2<sup>nd</sup> *Mind the Gap Report on Substance Use Disorder* report in January 2017. This report details data assets and gaps that will help inform the work of the task force.

## **4. Partnership and collaboration across state agencies**

Building Bright Futures - Vermont Insights is member of the Data Governance Council and its workgroup on integration of early childhood datasets into the SLDS. Once early childhood cross-agency datasets are developed to answer essential questions defined by the Data Governance Program, Vermont Insights will make the data easily accessible for use through its platform of uniform tables, maps, charts, and narratives.

One hundred people attended the 5th "Data Stewards and Stakeholders Meeting, Connecting Data for Vermont's Communities, Children and Families" meeting in April 2016. The meeting topic included discussions about innovative data practices, including how to align, share and use data over time and across sectors for the well-being of Vermont's communities, children and families. What was most striking were the attendees' engagement and focus. People were leaning in, absorbing, thinking and talking. The true value of Vermont Insights comes from data shared by state agencies and organizations, but getting commitments to share data is difficult and time consuming. One participant wrote "All agencies across Vermont share similar struggles with updating, maintaining, and sharing data. VT INSIGHTS is really providing creativity and support to make this transition to shared data easier and more efficient."

## 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>	2,285	38.12%
<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	4,607	38.12%
<b>Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry</b>	7,070	38.12%
<b>Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families</b>	13,962	38.12%

<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.

For Year 3, the 2015 1 Year American Community Survey results for children under 6 in households at 200% of Federal Poverty Level (FPL) was used to determine the percentage of low-income children for each of the smaller age groups: under age 1, 1-2 year olds and the 3-5 year olds.

The following steps were taken to determine the number and percent of low-income families by age group.

1. Using the 2015 American Community Survey (B17024: AGE BY RATIO OF INCOME TO POVERTY LEVEL IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS) determine for Vermont the percentage of children under six years are under 200% of the Federal poverty level. Vermont = 38.12%

The 2015 ACS percentage for children under 6 years was used to determine the number of children from low-income families for all age groups.

2. Using the Vermont population estimates (Census Bureau and Vermont Department of Health) using Vermont Insights: <http://vermontinsights.org/indicators/report/19> determine the estimates for each age group.

The 2015 total population estimates for infants = 5,994

The 2015 total population estimates for toddlers ages 1 through 2 = 12,085

The 2015 total population estimates for preschoolers ages 3 to 5, including five year olds = 18,547

The 2015 total number of children birth to kindergarten entry (birth to five, including five year olds) = 36,626

3. Multiply each age group by the percentage of low-income for children under 6 years (38.12%)

**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>	1,071	2.9%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>		
Reside on "Indian Lands"		
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	35	0.09%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	68	0.2%
Are in foster care	521	1.4%
Other 1 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>	Children served by the Dept of Child and Family Services (DCF)	
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.

Vermont does not have accurate information about the methodology used to generate this data for the grant application. As such, we chose to leave blank any category for which we do not have updated, accurate data. In our 2014 APR we were able to include updated data only on the number of children in foster care. Starting in Year 2, our data stewards were able to get a few additional data points.

Population estimates for the total number of children birth to kindergarten entry comes from the Census Bureau and Vermont Department of Health using Vermont Insights: <http://vermontinsights.org/indicators/report/19>. The 2015 total number of children birth to kindergarten entry (birth to five, including five year olds) = 36,626

The data on children with disabilities or developmental delays comes from the 12/1/15 ChildCount. This data only reflects 3 to 5 year olds, excluding 5 year olds who were reported as being in kindergarten.

The data on migrant children is from the AOE Migrant Education Program (and submitted to USED through the Consolidated State Performance Report), for the school year 2015-16. This data only reflects 3 to 5 year olds, excluding 5 year olds who were reported as being in kindergarten.

Homeless Data is from the Title I/ Homeless Participation report and only reflects those identified by local school homeless liaisons (it likely represents a very small percent of actual homeless children aged 3-5).

The data on children in foster care comes from a Point-In-Time Rate of Children and Youth (per 1,000) for calendar year 2015 in the Vermont Department for Children and Families (DCF) Custody by Geography, Age, and Year Report, <http://vermontinsights.org/dcf-custody-point-in-time-rate>.

The VT Agency of Education is only required under ESEA, Title III, English Language Acquisition to collect data on English learners in Public Schools K-12. They do not collect data for children birth to kindergarten entry.

**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>	0	0	7,326	7,326
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	FY16 PreK Evaluation Report			
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	146	392	1,173	1,711
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Head Start Program Information Report for the 2015 - 2016 Program year			
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	250	212	1,071	1,533
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	for Part B: Dec 1 2015 Child Count, only children in inclusive settings, not including those in kindergarten; for Part C: Child Care Financial Assistance Database as of 12/31/16			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	0	20	3,221	3,241
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Title I Participation Report for the 2015-2016 school year			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	1,211	1,043	3,138	5,393
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	from Bright Futures Information System as of 12/31/16			
<b>Other 1</b>	0	0	318	318
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Education Initiative (EEI)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Early Education Initiative (EEI) Annual Reports, July 2016			
<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>				

**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 6</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<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.

**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	87	3	127	131	3	23	5,652
<i>Specify:</i>	Publicly Funded PreK						
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>							
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C							
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	20	1	20	31	0	8	1,191
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program							
Other 1							
<i>Describe:</i>	Early Education Initiative Grant Programs						
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
Other 3							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 4							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 5							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 6							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 7							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 8							
<i>Describe:</i>							

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

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

AOE source for State Funded Preschool: School Census, Oct 1, 2015

Race/ethnicity data on Head Start and Early Head Start children is unavailable because the federal Office of Head Start, in its annual Head Start Program Information Reports, collects and reports the number of children and pregnant women, not just children.

VT AOE collects race/ethnicity data for students participating in Title I services in aggregate. Local Education Agencies report the number of students participating in Title 1 by grade (including PreK) and then also the race/ethnicity across all grades. AOE cannot report the race/ethnicity of preK participants only.

Part B data is from the Dec 1 2015 Child Count.

Because CCDF funded programs and Part C do not extract race and ethnicity data on a regular basis, we have not reported anything here. We continue to work on developing a report.

**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>	0	0	0		
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$16,716,050	\$20,795,108	\$22,593,725	\$29,781,745	
<i>Specify:</i>	Publicly Funded PreK				
<b>State contributions to IDEA Part C</b>	0	0	0		
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry</b>	\$16,620,184	\$23,063,924	\$22,375,492	\$24,847,584	
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$6,891,855	\$9,688,993	\$5,378,142	\$5,341,783	
<b>State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met</b>					
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>	\$34,063,287	\$27,767,498	\$32,550,925	\$29,959,090	
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>	\$1,098,364	\$1,031,751	\$200,000		
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Education Initiative Grant Programs				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	0				
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 5</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 6</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					

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

**Funding for each Fiscal Year**

<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>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 8</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Total State contributions:</b>	<b>\$75,389,740</b>	<b>\$82,347,274</b>	<b>\$83,098,284</b>	<b>\$89,930,202</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.

For our 2016 APR, we have revised the reported amounts for all categories, baseline through Year 3, based on updated and more accurate methodologies.

There is no supplemental state funding for Head Start and Early Head Start.

State funded preschool and special education funding numbers are based on actual expenditure data as reported by the school districts at the end of each fiscal year. Data are reported by function, program, and object with multiple programs in each function and multiple objects in each program. Some dollars expended are expended twice, as an example, oftentimes from one school district to another and then on the students by the second school district. So each school district is reporting expenditures of some of the same dollars. The revamped numbers for previous years and this year excluded those duplicate costs correctly.

Total State Contributions to CCDF are calculated based on line 2 column B and column D of the ACF 696 report

TANF spending on Early Learning Development Programs is calculated based on line 3 B of the ACF 196

Other State Contributions for EEI: Early Essential Initiative grants are 100% state funded in an annual appropriation from the State legislature. 2015, Year 2, was the final year of funding for the grants.

**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> )	5,711	5,871	5,681	7,326	
<i>Specify:</i>	State-Funded Preschool				
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> ( <i>funded enrollment</i> )	1,368	1,458	1,516	1,447	
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> ( <i>annual December 1 count</i> )	1,296	1,318	1,604	1,533	
<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> )	2,733	2,639	2,925	3,241	
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> ( <i>average monthly served</i> )	6,184	5,091	5,389	5,393	
<b>Other 1</b>	1,001	1,031	1,236	318	
<i>Describe:</i>	Early Education Initiative Grant Programs				
<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.

See data sources in Table A (1)-3a, in addition to the below:

Year 3 PreK enrollment data comes from the FY16 PreK Evaluation Report. Baseline - Year Two enrollment data comes from the school census of each reporting year.

NOTE: The data displayed here regarding Title I are Preschool students served. However, we do not collect which are on IEPs.

Head Start: On May 12, 2016, Rebecca Fenerty, Project Manager, Office of Head Start, Region I/STG International, Project Manager (ACF/STGI) in Boston, MA supplied Ben Allen with the 1,447 Head Start and Early Head Start funded enrollment figure for Federal Fiscal Year 2016. Generally, the reduction of 69 funded Head Start and Early Head Start slots is a result of the federal Office of Head Start approving enrollment reduction requests submitted by Head Start grantees to help raise the salaries of Head Start teachers and staff and approving requests submitted Head Start/Early Head Start grantees to convert Head Start slots to Early Head Start slots to serve less preschool-age children and more infants and toddlers. Generally, two Early Head Start slots cost the same as three Head Start slots.

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



## 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.

Overall, spending was at 43.6% of the Year 3 budget and will be carried forward to Year 4. Planning is in process for the upcoming request for NCE that Vermont expects to submit by late Spring 2017. The budget categories that lagged in spending were Line 6 Contractual and Line 11 Grants. However, there are agreements in place that have approx. \$7.9 million yet to be expensed.

Due to the delays for Projects 19, 22 and 24 which resulted in low or no spending during Year 3 Budget period. Vermont submitted an Expedited Spending Plan on December 14, 2016 detailing the plan to expedite our spending during Year 4. Please note that Vermont is a cash basis reporting entity which means we report expenses that are cash out the door rather than invoice pending payment (accrual basis).

### Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

We do not plan any substantive changes in Year 4. Vermont is nearing the completion of our assessment of all projects and expects to submit a No-Cost Extension request in late summer 2017.

## **Project Budget 1**

**Project Name: Managing the Grant**

---

### **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.

For balances left at end of Year 3 associated with personnel, those were moved to Year 4 Budgets.

Vermont had savings for salary and fringe which we anticipate will support staffing needs for NCE Year 5 request. Technical Assistance balance is \$161,502.55 which Vermont will submit prior approval requests for its use during Year 4 and NCE Year 5 request. In Vermont's Expedited Spending Plan, \$24,000 is earmarked for RTT ELC Grantee Conference in 2017.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget. If approved, Year 5 NCE will use existing budget to support the additional time.

## **Project Budget 2**

**Project Name: Building Bright Futures - Empowering Regional Councils**

---

### **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.

There was a balance left in the amount of \$110,170.03 which will be moved to Year 4 Budget as it will be used to reimburse contractual expenses for December 2016 invoices that were yet to be paid as of 12/31/2016.

Remaining balance of \$1,025,313.03 is expected to be used fully by Vermont's contract with Building Bright Futures.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## Project Budget 3

**Project Name:** Early Childhood Leadership Institute

---

### 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.

There was a balance left in the amount of \$60,692.00 which will be moved to Year 4 Budget as it will be used to reimburse contractual expenses for 2016 invoices that were yet to be paid as of 12/31/2016.

Remaining balance of \$297,355.00 is expected to be fully used by our contract with the Snelling Center. Year 4 expenditures are expected to continue support for Cohort #3 and begin support for Cohort #4.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget. If approved, Year 5 NCE will use existing budget to support the additional time.

## Project Budget 4

**Project Name:** Expand Strengthening Families Child Care Programs

---

### 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.

For the Contractual budget category, the amount of \$149,644.00 which will be moved to Year 4 Budget .

For the Line 11 Grants, there was a balance of \$401,010.25 that will be moved to Year 4 to support the agreements that are in place for the following agreements: Educational Development Corp., MJ Children's Center, Little Dipper Center, and Rutland Community Based Child Center.

We expect to add funds to existing agreements for the following entities: Vermont Birth to 3, MJ Children's Center, Little Dipper Center, and Rutland Community Based Child Center.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## Project Budget 5

**Project Name: Annual STARS awards**

---

### 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.

There was a balance of \$493,967.00 that has been moved to Year 4 for Line 11 Grants. Due to delay in posting expense of approx. \$373,000.00 for STARS Bonuses (for the period 7/1/16-12/31/16) to this project, the actual balance moving to Year 4 is \$123,967.00. Vermont anticipates the \$373,000 STARS Bonuses for the period 7/1/16-12/31/16 will be posted during February 2017.

Annual bonuses average \$600K per year and it is expected to be expended at this rate for CY2017.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget. If approved, Year 5 NCE will use existing budget to support the additional time.

## **Project Budget 6**

**Project Name: Validating and Evaluation of STARS**

---

### **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.

There was a balance left in the amount of \$369,623.00 which will be moved to Year 4 Budgets to support the Child Trends contract. It is anticipated that this contract will be complete by the end of 2017.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## **Project Budget 7**

**Project Name:** Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

For the Line 11 Grant to MJ Children's Center, it is anticipated that the \$28,609.62 balance will be moved to Year 4 Budgets. The agreement was amended adding \$143,000.00 during Year 3 to support activities for the period 9/1/16 - 12/31/17.

Our partner, Agency of Education (AOE), executed a contract with The Lewin Group in 2016 which has been supporting the monitoring work in this project for Year 3. The Year 3 balance of \$144,174.63 will be moved to Year 4 to continue supporting the monitoring work.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget. If approved, Year 5 NCE will use existing budget to support the additional time.



## Project Budget 8

**Project Name:** Children's Integrated Services Specialized Child Care

---

### 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.

For the Line 11 Grants balance, it is anticipated that the \$1,654.32 balance will be moved to Year 4 Budgets. It is anticipated that the remaining balance available will be added to existing agreements to the following entities: Lamoille Family Center, Rutland Area VNA, Sunrise Family Resources and The Family Place.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget. If approved, Year 5 NCE will use existing budget to support the additional time.

## Project Budget 9

**Project Name:** Revised VELS & Dissemination/Training

---

### 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.

For the Line 6 Contractual balance, it is anticipated that the \$205,732.92 balance will be moved to Year 4 Budget.

For the Line 8 Other balance, it is anticipated that the \$109,716.80 balance will be moved to Year 4 Budgets.

Available funding in these budget categories will be used to support several small contracts. Regional Training, VELS E-Learning Modules, and VELS Family Guide work.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## Project Budget 10

**Project Name: Comprehensive Assessment Strategies**

---

### 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.

For the balances left to support Assessment position (salary, fringe, operating, etc.), these balances were moved to Year 4 Budget. Also, funding from Contractual will be moved to support TS Gold & CLASS Trainers as Agency of Education has changed how it reimburses trainers. Trainers are defined as employees due the nature of the work performed and to comply with regulations funds will need to be moved from Contractual to Salary/Fringe.

For the Line 6 Contractual balance of \$214,175, the balance will be moved Year 4 Budget Salary/Fringe Lines.

### 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.

Other than the items listed above, Vermont does not anticipate further budget changes for Year 4.

## **Project Budget 11**

**Project Name: Home Visiting**

---

### **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.

For the DCF-CDD portion of the budget, salary/fringe vacancy savings were moved to Year 4. Small travel overages were covered by supplies/other budget categories. The Line 6 contractual balance of \$183,996.80 was moved to Year 4 Budget. There is an existing contracts with Ingham Institute and PAT which are expected to continue.

For the VDH portion of the budget supporting the Analyst position, balances were moved to Year 4 Salary/Fringe and Travel needs.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget. If approved, Year 5 NCE will use existing budget to support the additional time.

## Project Budget 12

**Project Name:** Health Care Consultation/Developmental Screening (Help Me Grow)

### 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.

Budget categories were moved to support Year 4 budget.

Approval was received February 17, 2016 to add \$75,460.00 to Project 12 to support the rollout of the universal development screening registry and will be placed in the Line 6 contractual category when the APR process is completed.

For Line 6 Contractual, it is anticipated current contracts will continue.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## **Project Budget 13**

**Project Name:** MTSS Supporting Socio-Emotional Development

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

The Year 3 balance Line 6 Contractual of \$56,102.69 will be moved to Year 4 which is expected to be used by existing contracts with M Sullivan, Pyramid, University of North Carolina, and multiple small contracts.

The Year 3 balance Line 11 Grants of \$13,371.24 will be moved to Year 4 which is expected to support \$5K annual mini-grants to School Districts and Regional Councils.

The Associated Supplies/Other remaining budgets were moved forward to support the contracts and grants as work progresses during Year 4.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## Project Budget 14

**Project Name: Apprenticeship**

---

### 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.

For the Line 11 Grants balance, it is anticipated that the \$10,103.67 balance will be moved to Year 4 Budgets. The agreement with VCCICC is expected to be completed during Year 4 and utilize the remaining agreement amount.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## **Project Budget 15**

**Project Name: Evaluate Implement of MATCH in VT**

---

### **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.

Line 6 Contractual balance of \$50,907.20 will be moved to Year 4. \$31,000 of this balance will be moved to Line 11 as part of a prior approval request that will be submitted February 10, 2017 which proposes additional resources to provide training and mentoring for the Specialized Child Care programs.

Line 11 Grants Year 3 balance of \$135,000.00 will be moved to Year 4. The implementation of MATCH started in Year 3 with grant program applications being solicited, received/reviewed and awarded during Year 3. Funding to support these grants are expected to show expenditures in the first quarter of Year 4. There has been a coordinated effort with Project 8 to begin to implement MATCH with Children's Integrated Services as a contract for this work will be issued.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.



## Project Budget 16

**Project Name:** TEACH / Higher Ed

---

### 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.

Line 11 Grants remaining balance of \$78,649.75 will be moved to Year 4. DCF CDD and AOE expects to use the remaining balance to support VAEYC contract and VB5 contract.

Line 6 Contractual remaining balance of \$102,011.93 will be moved to Year 4. This balance and Year 4 Budget is expected to support Vermont Higher Ed, VAEYC, Camille Catlett, Cheryl Mitchell, and other small contracts.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## **Project Budget 17**

**Project Name: Workforce Study**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

Line 6 Contractual \$18,536.25 balance will be moved to Year 4. \$93,405.00 will be used to support workforce validation efforts outlined in the contract with COPE and Associates.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## **Project Budget 18**

**Project Name:** Kindergarten Readiness Survey

---

### **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.

Line 6 contractual balance of \$74,250 will be moved to Year 4. The survey has been completed during Year 3. Remaining work in this project includes: R4K!S e-learning modules and Kindergarten & Moving Up Booklets.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.

## **Project Budget 19**

**Project Name: CIS 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.

All excess balances were moved to Year 4. This project is moving slower than anticipated but is expected to move forward in Year 4. GAP analysis were completed in Year 2 which will allow for completion of this project's objectives and using the available funds as prudently as possible.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget except a prior approval request submitted February 10, 2017 to move \$52,750 to Project 21 to support additional deliverables for Data Governance work. If approved, Year 5 NCE will use existing budget to support the additional time.

## Project Budget 20

**Project Name:** Vermont Insights (Early Childhood Data Reporting 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.

This project funds have been moved to Project 2 as Building Bright Futures is responsible for the management of this project and the contract to support BBF is more easily managed by merging with Project 2.

### 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.

Closed for Year 4.

## **Project Budget 21**

**Project Name:** Data Governance

---

### **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.

Year 3 budget exceeded the \$60,940.00 by \$9,674.00 and will need be funded by moving Year 4 Budget to support activities provided by our data governance contractor, DataSmith Solutions, Inc.

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

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

There is a prior approval request submitted on February 10, 2017 to move \$52,750.00 to this project from Project 19 to support additional deliverables from our data governance contractor.

## **Project Budget 22**

**Project Name: SLDS (State 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.

This project was slated to begin work in Year 3 and have been delayed until Year 4 as SLDS project is a year behind schedule. Per the December 14, 2016 Expedited Spending Plan, the following contracts are expected: Agilis Technologies (project management) contract of \$50,000.00, \$200,000.00 contract for our SLDS vendor, HMH, \$100,000 for the SIS vendor contracts, and \$50,000 to support Vermont Insights data work.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget. If approved, Year 5 NCE will use existing budget to support the additional time.

## **Project Budget 23**

**Project Name: Sustaining Program Effects into Early Elementary Grades**

---

### **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.

Line 6 contractual balance of \$29,927.82 will be moved to Year 4. It is expected that remaining contractual balance will support the following contracts currently in place: UNC First School and Snapshot. Pilot sites are operational since August 2015 and are supported by Line 11 Grants. The Line 11 Grants balance of \$48,424.21 will be moved to Year 4.

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

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget.



## Project Budget 24

**Project Name: Promise Communities**

---

### 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.

For personnel/fringe budget categories, the small balances were moved to Year 3. Year 2 Travel balance was moved to Year 3 and Year 4. Year 2 Equipment balance was moved to Supplies/Other for Year 3 and Year 4 as expenses moving forward as expected to reflect our spending experience for Year 2.

Line 6 Contractual balance of \$154,711.16 will moved to Year 4.

Line 11 Grants balance will be moved to Year 4 in the amount of \$2,240,000.00. Per the December 14, 2016 Expedited Spending Plan, 6 Communities will be supported with \$1,200,000.00 by March 31, 2017, 1 Communities will be supported with \$200,000.00 by June 30, 2017, and 7 Communities will be supported in the amount of \$1,050,000.00 by September 30, 2017 using Grants Budget. Additional expedited spending from Contractual and Other budget categories includes \$110,000.00 to support BBF Regional Councils work with Promise Communities and \$162,300 to support RBA, Community Cafes, Strengthening Families work and Appreciative Inquiry Trainings.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to Year 4 Budget. If approved, Year 5 NCE will use existing budget to support the additional time.

**Project Budget 25**

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

***VERMONT'S RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 24 PROJECTS.  
PAGES 114-118 HAVE BEEN DELETED.***

### RTT-ELC 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	\$268,992.94	\$862,345.08	\$727,080.02	\$0.00	\$1,858,418.04
2. Fringe Benefits	\$97,687.29	\$349,882.18	\$282,284.73	\$0.00	\$729,854.20
3. Travel	\$6,907.99	\$45,034.84	\$87,127.37	\$0.00	\$139,070.20
4. Equipment	\$2,826.43	\$3,030.81	\$406.03	\$0.00	\$6,263.27
5. Supplies	\$212.18	\$5,624.28	\$19,157.24	\$0.00	\$24,993.70
6. Contractual	\$1,020,602.12	\$3,053,006.42	\$3,281,466.58	\$0.00	\$7,355,075.12
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$9,150.21	\$38,501.58	\$43,102.59	\$0.00	\$90,754.38
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,406,379.16	\$4,357,425.19	\$4,440,624.56	\$0.00	\$10,204,428.91
10. Indirect Costs*	\$107,808.76	\$307,707.93	\$344,965.76	\$0.00	\$760,482.45
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$532,452.39	\$1,176,706.91	\$2,102,244.16	\$0.00	\$3,811,403.46
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$3,954.94	\$13,278.22	\$41,731.29	\$0.00	\$58,964.45
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$2,050,595.25	\$5,855,118.25	\$6,929,565.77	\$0.00	\$14,835,279.27
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$13,978,208.07	\$13,286,177.02	\$13,532,366.94	\$0.00	\$40,796,752.03
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$16,028,803.32	\$19,141,295.27	\$20,461,932.71	\$0.00	\$55,632,031.30

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 1 - Managing the Grant**

<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	\$99,167.29	\$252,549.42	\$238,383.14	\$0.00	\$590,099.85
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,013.81	\$81,153.80	\$70,774.92	\$0.00	\$177,942.53
3. Travel	\$2,874.56	\$6,226.83	\$9,630.11	\$0.00	\$18,731.50
4. Equipment	\$2,826.43	\$1,977.24	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,803.67
5. Supplies	\$212.18	\$1,773.82	\$525.65	\$0.00	\$2,511.65
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	\$2,794.04	\$12,774.20	\$10,377.21	\$0.00	\$25,945.45
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$133,888.31	\$356,455.31	\$329,691.03	\$0.00	\$820,034.65
10. Indirect Costs*	\$16,589.86	\$35,196.33	\$37,818.18	\$0.00	\$89,604.37
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	\$3,954.94	\$13,278.22	\$41,731.29	\$0.00	\$58,964.45
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$154,433.11	\$404,929.86	\$409,240.50	\$0.00	\$968,603.47
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$9,463.44	\$16,193.70	\$23,095.90	\$0.00	\$48,753.04
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$163,896.55	\$421,123.56	\$432,336.40	\$0.00	\$1,017,356.51

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 2 - Building Bright Futures: Empowering 12 Regional Councils**

<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	\$652,586.76	\$1,106,617.00	\$1,210,852.80	\$0.00	\$2,970,056.56
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)	\$652,586.76	\$1,106,617.00	\$1,210,852.80	\$0.00	\$2,970,056.56
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)	\$652,586.76	\$1,106,617.00	\$1,210,852.80	\$0.00	\$2,970,056.56
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$250,031.55	\$299,688.77	\$685,019.49	\$0.00	\$1,234,739.81
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$902,618.31	\$1,406,305.77	\$1,895,872.29	\$0.00	\$4,204,796.37

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 - Early Childhood Leadership Institute (ECLI)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$23,050.00	\$163,810.00	\$162,160.00	\$0.00	\$349,020.00
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)	\$23,050.00	\$163,810.00	\$162,160.00	\$0.00	\$349,020.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$4,625.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,625.00
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)	\$27,675.00	\$163,810.00	\$162,160.00	\$0.00	\$353,645.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$27,675.00	\$163,810.00	\$162,160.00	\$0.00	\$353,645.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Expand Strengthening Families (SF) Child Care Programs**

<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	\$237,615.00	\$10,356.00	\$0.00	\$247,971.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$237,615.00	\$10,356.00	\$0.00	\$247,971.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$6,013.00	\$6,013.00	\$0.00	\$12,026.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$32,382.06	\$114,124.00	\$712,483.69	\$0.00	\$858,989.75
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)	\$32,382.06	\$357,752.00	\$728,852.69	\$0.00	\$1,118,986.75
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$923,931.01	\$1,149,275.00	\$894,951.85	\$0.00	\$2,968,157.86
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$956,313.07	\$1,507,027.00	\$1,623,804.54	\$0.00	\$4,087,144.61

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 - Annual STARS Awards**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$45,435.00	\$644,600.00	\$490,806.20	\$0.00	\$1,180,841.20
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)	\$45,435.00	\$644,600.00	\$490,806.20	\$0.00	\$1,180,841.20
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$151,738.31	\$2,601.00	\$585,362.42	\$0.00	\$739,701.73
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$197,173.31	\$647,201.00	\$1,076,168.62	\$0.00	\$1,920,542.93

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



**Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - STARS Evaluation and Validation**

<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	\$134,546.00	\$125,877.28	\$0.00	\$260,423.28
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	\$134,546.00	\$125,877.28	\$0.00	\$260,423.28
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$9,250.00	\$4,625.00	\$0.00	\$13,875.00
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	\$143,796.00	\$130,502.28	\$0.00	\$274,298.28
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	\$143,796.00	\$130,502.28	\$0.00	\$274,298.28

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 - Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs**

<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	\$89,373.25	\$0.00	\$89,373.25
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	\$89,373.25	\$0.00	\$89,373.25
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,016.47	\$0.00	\$9,016.47
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$29,940.33	\$119,761.00	\$118,761.38	\$0.00	\$268,462.71
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)	\$29,940.33	\$119,761.00	\$217,151.10	\$0.00	\$366,852.43
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$161,816.23	\$1,523,125.22	\$111,451.00	\$0.00	\$1,796,392.45
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$191,756.56	\$1,642,886.22	\$328,602.10	\$0.00	\$2,163,244.88

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 8 - Specialized Child Care**

<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	\$233.00	\$184.37	\$0.00	\$417.37
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,681.31	\$0.00	\$7,681.31
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$233.00	\$7,865.68	\$0.00	\$8,098.68
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.	\$243,320.00	\$17,864.00	\$139,647.00	\$0.00	\$400,831.00
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)	\$243,320.00	\$18,097.00	\$147,512.68	\$0.00	\$408,929.68
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$2,771,109.71	\$2,016,804.00	\$1,754,119.60	\$0.00	\$6,542,033.31
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$3,014,429.71	\$2,034,901.00	\$1,901,632.28	\$0.00	\$6,950,962.99

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 - Complete revision of the Vermont Early Learning Standards (VELS) and implement the new Birth-Grade 3 high quality standards.**

<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	\$3,000.00	\$7,970.00	\$14,806.08	\$0.00	\$25,776.08
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,283.20	\$0.00	\$5,283.20
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$3,000.00	\$7,970.00	\$20,089.28	\$0.00	\$31,059.28
10. Indirect Costs*	\$555.00	\$1,474.45	\$3,218.73	\$0.00	\$5,248.18
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)	\$3,555.00	\$9,444.45	\$23,308.01	\$0.00	\$36,307.46
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$3,969.97	\$9,826.23	\$7,806.66	\$0.00	\$21,602.86
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$7,524.97	\$19,270.68	\$31,114.67	\$0.00	\$57,910.32

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 - Develop Vermont's EC Comprehensive Assessment System Plan. Increase educator's knowledge and use of formative assessment (TS GOLD) and CLASS to inform practice.**

<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	\$34,542.66	\$31,730.07	\$0.00	\$66,272.73
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$26,925.38	\$15,798.47	\$0.00	\$42,723.85
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$916.21	\$2,971.45	\$0.00	\$3,887.66
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$119.57	\$406.03	\$0.00	\$525.60
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$147.16	\$11,781.82	\$0.00	\$11,928.98
6. Contractual	\$29,250.00	\$58,750.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	\$108,000.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$580.00	\$3,112.08	\$5,395.26	\$0.00	\$9,087.34
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$29,830.00	\$124,513.06	\$88,083.10	\$0.00	\$242,426.16
10. Indirect Costs*	\$5,518.55	\$13,579.19	\$13,020.02	\$0.00	\$32,117.76
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)	\$35,348.55	\$138,092.25	\$101,103.12	\$0.00	\$274,543.92
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$3,301.20	\$8,370.60	\$3,025.17	\$0.00	\$14,696.97
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$38,649.75	\$146,462.85	\$104,128.29	\$0.00	\$289,240.89

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 - Evidence based Home Visiting**

<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	\$57,534.09	\$134,863.00	\$80,379.87	\$0.00	\$272,776.96
2. Fringe Benefits	\$25,656.43	\$60,046.00	\$25,638.06	\$0.00	\$111,340.49
3. Travel	\$1,417.28	\$17,813.00	\$49,491.46	\$0.00	\$68,721.74
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$122.00	\$193.00	\$0.00	\$315.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$62,176.00	\$186,636.20	\$0.00	\$248,812.20
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$592.67	\$1,190.00	\$3,055.40	\$0.00	\$4,838.07
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$85,200.47	\$276,210.00	\$345,393.99	\$0.00	\$706,804.46
10. Indirect Costs*	\$35,363.39	\$46,486.60	\$46,246.01	\$0.00	\$128,096.00
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)	\$120,563.86	\$322,696.60	\$391,640.00	\$0.00	\$834,900.46
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$9,320,420.44	\$7,554,530.00	\$8,915,487.79	\$0.00	\$25,790,438.23
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$9,440,984.30	\$7,877,226.60	\$9,307,127.79	\$0.00	\$26,625,338.69

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 12 - Early Childhood Wellness

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$79,334.00	\$179,595.00	\$121,089.00	\$0.00	\$380,018.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$35,833.00	\$84,350.00	\$60,284.00	\$0.00	\$180,467.00
3. Travel	\$1,263.00	\$8,766.00	\$6,799.00	\$0.00	\$16,828.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,028.00	\$0.00	\$2,028.00
6. Contractual	\$31,408.00	\$232,575.00	\$282,738.00	\$0.00	\$546,721.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$176.00	\$3,656.00	\$1,691.00	\$0.00	\$5,523.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$148,014.00	\$508,942.00	\$474,629.00	\$0.00	\$1,131,585.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$19,302.00	\$29,409.00	\$22,401.00	\$0.00	\$71,112.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$37,375.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$37,375.00
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)	\$204,691.00	\$538,351.00	\$497,030.00	\$0.00	\$1,240,072.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$259,827.25	\$0.00	\$259,827.25
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$204,691.00	\$538,351.00	\$756,857.25	\$0.00	\$1,499,899.25

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 13 - Scale up Early MTSS state, regional, local level leadership and organizational support systems to ensure sustainability of evidence based practices.**

<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	\$84.00	\$0.00	\$84.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$1,500.30	\$3,766.43	\$0.00	\$5,266.73
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$76,039.62	\$287,621.83	\$0.00	\$363,661.45
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$820.00	\$750.00	\$0.00	\$1,570.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$78,359.92	\$292,222.26	\$0.00	\$370,582.18
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$13,287.31	\$46,377.43	\$0.00	\$59,664.74
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$11,064.91	\$101,163.85	\$0.00	\$112,228.76
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	\$102,712.14	\$439,763.54	\$0.00	\$542,475.68
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$5,123.70	\$30,440.30	\$13,053.96	\$0.00	\$48,617.96
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$5,123.70	\$133,152.44	\$452,817.50	\$0.00	\$591,093.64

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 14 - Vermont Child Care Apprenticeship Program**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$64,000.00	\$135,043.00	\$193,642.00	\$0.00	\$392,685.00
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)	\$64,000.00	\$135,043.00	\$193,642.00	\$0.00	\$392,685.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$330,293.97	\$631,599.00	\$275,945.00	\$0.00	\$1,237,837.97
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$394,293.97	\$766,642.00	\$469,587.00	\$0.00	\$1,630,522.97

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 15 - Evaluate and Implement MATCH

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$51,211.00	\$17,881.80	\$0.00	\$69,092.80
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	\$51,211.00	\$17,881.80	\$0.00	\$69,092.80
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$8,325.00	\$4,625.00	\$0.00	\$12,950.00
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	\$59,536.00	\$22,506.80	\$0.00	\$82,042.80
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	\$59,536.00	\$22,506.80	\$0.00	\$82,042.80

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 16 - Support the establishment of T.E.A.C.H. in Vermont by providing funds for scholarships. Reinvigorate a Work Group of IHE's to enhance ECE in-service and preservice programs and dismantle barriers EC staff face in advancing credentials. IHE's and other PD organizations will develop advanced and specialized PD opportunities on topics geared to supporting high needs children.**

<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	\$31,844.97	\$92,143.10	\$0.00	\$123,988.07
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	\$31,844.97	\$92,143.10	\$0.00	\$123,988.07
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$5,891.32	\$11,820.76	\$0.00	\$17,712.08
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$80,000.00	\$134,250.00	\$291,517.25	\$0.00	\$505,767.25
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)	\$80,000.00	\$171,986.29	\$395,481.11	\$0.00	\$647,467.40
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$37,600.16	\$34,086.09	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$71,686.25
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$117,600.16	\$206,072.38	\$395,481.11	\$0.00	\$719,153.65

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 17 - Design and implement workforce survey**

<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	\$75.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$75.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$134.25	\$0.00	\$134.25
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$1,977.00	\$1,000.00	\$129,591.00	\$0.00	\$132,568.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,977.00	\$1,075.00	\$129,725.25	\$0.00	\$132,777.25
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$4,625.00	\$4,625.00	\$0.00	\$9,250.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$1,977.00	\$5,700.00	\$134,350.25	\$0.00	\$142,027.25
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,977.00	\$5,700.00	\$134,350.25	\$0.00	\$142,027.25

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 18 - Measuring Kindergarten Readiness**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,750.00	\$0.00	\$5,750.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,750.00	\$0.00	\$5,750.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$948.75	\$0.00	\$948.75
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	\$6,698.75	\$0.00	\$6,698.75
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$8,027.25	\$3,812.87	\$1,125.32	\$0.00	\$12,965.44
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$8,027.25	\$3,812.87	\$7,824.07	\$0.00	\$19,664.19

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 19 - CIS 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	\$0.00	\$54,182.00	\$41,104.98	\$0.00	\$95,286.98
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$22,854.00	\$23,370.37	\$0.00	\$46,224.37
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$77,036.00	\$64,475.35	\$0.00	\$141,511.35
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$46,128.37	\$53,030.00	\$0.00	\$99,158.37
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	\$123,164.37	\$117,505.35	\$0.00	\$240,669.72
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	\$123,164.37	\$117,505.35	\$0.00	\$240,669.72

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 20 - Building Bright Futures-Early Childhood Data Reporting 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	\$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	\$279,330.36	\$584,325.00	\$178,640.05	\$0.00	\$1,042,295.41
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)	\$279,330.36	\$584,325.00	\$178,640.05	\$0.00	\$1,042,295.41
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)	\$279,330.36	\$584,325.00	\$178,640.05	\$0.00	\$1,042,295.41
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)	\$279,330.36	\$584,325.00	\$178,640.05	\$0.00	\$1,042,295.41

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 21 - Data Governance**

<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	\$60,560.00	\$70,704.00	\$0.00	\$131,264.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$60,560.00	\$70,704.00	\$0.00	\$131,264.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$2,312.50	\$4,625.00	\$0.00	\$6,937.50
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. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$62,872.50	\$75,329.00	\$0.00	\$138,201.50
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	\$62,872.50	\$75,329.00	\$0.00	\$138,201.50

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 22 - Link Essential Early Childhood Datasets with STATE Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and Transfer Integrated Data to Early Childhood Data Reporting System (ECDRS)**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$448.45	\$2,053.20	\$2,095.53	\$0.00	\$4,597.18
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$448.45	\$2,053.20	\$2,095.53	\$0.00	\$4,597.18

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 23 - Pilot a PreK through Grade 3 approach in 3-4 school districts with large percentages of children with high needs**

<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	\$2,191.80	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,191.80
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	\$195,193.83	\$373,604.35	\$0.00	\$568,798.18
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$7,709.30	\$8,269.21	\$0.00	\$15,978.51
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$205,094.93	\$381,873.56	\$0.00	\$586,968.49
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$16,751.18	\$7,576.73	\$0.00	\$24,327.91
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$54,222.79	\$0.00	\$54,222.79
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	\$221,846.11	\$443,673.08	\$0.00	\$665,519.19
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$932.68	\$3,771.04	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,703.72
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$932.68	\$225,617.15	\$443,673.08	\$0.00	\$670,222.91

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 24 - Promise Communities

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$32,957.56	\$206,538.00	\$214,392.96	\$0.00	\$453,888.52
2. Fringe Benefits	\$10,184.05	\$74,553.00	\$86,418.91	\$0.00	\$171,155.96
3. Travel	\$1,353.15	\$8,888.00	\$17,832.73	\$0.00	\$28,073.88
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$934.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$934.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$2,081.00	\$862.34	\$0.00	\$2,943.34
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$48,773.00	\$22,730.84	\$0.00	\$71,503.84
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$5,007.50	\$9,240.00	\$600.00	\$0.00	\$14,847.50
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$49,502.26	\$351,007.00	\$342,837.78	\$0.00	\$743,347.04
10. Indirect Costs*	\$25,854.96	\$68,978.68	\$68,978.68	\$0.00	\$163,812.32
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)	\$75,357.22	\$419,985.68	\$411,816.46	\$0.00	\$907,159.36
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)	\$75,357.22	\$419,985.68	\$411,816.46	\$0.00	\$907,159.36

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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