



**Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge
Application for Phase 2 Funding
CFDA Number: 84.412A**

October 25, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
Cover Letter to Secretary Duncan and Secretary Sebelius	
Section III. Application Cover Sheet & Assurances	
Application Cover Sheet	1
Application Assurances & Certifications	2
Section IV: Application	
Part 1: State Plan Overview	5
Part 2: Summary Table for Phase 2 Plan	12
Part 3: Narrative	
Section A(3) : Aligning & Coordinating Early Learning & Development	13
Section B(1): Developing & Adopting a Tiered Quality Rating Improvement System	15
Section B(2): Promoting Participation in the State’s Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	18
Section B(3): Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs	20
Section B(4): Promoting Access to High Quality Early Learning and Development Programs	21
Section B(5): Validating the Effectiveness of the State’s Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	24
Section C(1): Developing and Using Statewide High Quality Early Learning and Development Standards	25
Section C(4): Engaging and Supporting Families	30
Section D(1): Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a Progression of Credentials	34
Section E(2): Building or Enhancing an Early Learning Data System	38
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS	45
Invitational Priority 5: Encouraging Private Sector Support	46
Part 4. Tables and Performance Measures	
Tables A(1)-1 through 3	48
Table A(1)-4	53
Table A(1)-5	57
Tables ((1) 6-13	59
Performance Measures for B(2)(c)	63
Performance Measures for B(4)(c)(1)	64
Performance Measures for B(4)(c)(2)	65
Part 5. Budget	
Budget Part I: Tables and Narrative	67
Budget Part II: Participating State Agency Tables and Narrative	73
Indirect Cost Information	96
Part 6. MOU and Exhibit 1 – Participating State Agency Scope of Work	97

SECTION III: APPLICATION COVER SHEET, ASSURANCES, AND REQUIREMENTS
Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Phase 2
CFDA No. 84.412A

Legal Name of Applicant (Office of the Governor): Scott Walker	Applicant's Mailing Address: 201 E. Washington Avenue P.O. Box 8916 Madison, WI 53708-8916
Employer Identification Number: 26-2265832	Organizational DUNS: 825046159
Lead Agency: Wisconsin Department of Children and Families Contact Name: Eloise Anderson	Lead Agency Contact Phone: 608-267-9685 Lead Agency Contact Email Address: Eloise.anderson@wisconsin.gov
Required Applicant Signatures (<i>Must include signatures from an authorized representative of each Participating State Agency.</i>): <i>*See separate file for signed documents.</i> To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct. I further certify that I have read the application, am fully committed to it, and will support its implementation:	
Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name): Scott Walker	Telephone: 608-266-1212
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor:	Date:
Lead Agency Authorized Representative (Printed Name): Eloise Anderson	Agency Name: WI Department of Children and Families
Signature of Lead Agency Authorized Representative:	Date:
Participating State Agency Authorized Representative (Printed Name): Tony Evers, State Superintendent	Agency Name: WI Department of Public Instruction
Signature of Participating State Agency Authorized Representative:	Date:
Participating State Agency Authorized Representative (Printed Name): Dennis Smith, Secretary	Agency Name: WI Department of Health Services
Signature of Participating State Agency Authorized Representative:	Date:

**APPLICATION ASSURANCES
(CFDA No. 84.412A)**

The Governor assures the following:

- a) While the State may make appropriate adjustments to the scope, budget, timelines, and performance targets, consistent with the reduced amount of funding that is available under Phase 2 RTT-ELC, the State will maintain consistency with the absolute priority and meet all program and eligibility requirements of the FY 2011 RTT-ELC competition.
- b) The State has updated tables 1-5 from section (A)(1) of its FY 2011 application. In addition, if the State has made any significant changes to the commitments, financial investments, numbers of children served, legislation, policies, practices, or other key areas of the program described in section (A)(1) of its FY 2011 application, it has submitted an explanation of those changes, including updates to tables 6-13 from section (A)(1) as needed.

The State will maintain, in a manner consistent with its updates to tables 1-13, its commitment to and investment in high-quality, accessible early learning and development programs and services for children with high needs, as described in section (A)(1) of its FY 2011 RTT-ELC application.

- c) Subject to adjustments made because of the reduced amount of funding available under the Phase 2 RTT-ELC award process, the State will maintain its plan to establish strong participation and commitment by Participating State Agencies and other early learning and development stakeholders as described in section (A)(3) of its FY 2011 RTT-ELC application.
- d) The State will maintain its commitment to integrating and aligning resources and policies across Participating State Agencies as described in section (A)(3) of its FY 2011 RTT-ELC application.
- e) The State will comply with all of the accountability, transparency, and reporting requirements that applied to the FY 2011 RTT-ELC competition, as per the notice inviting applications for the FY 2011 RTT-ELC competition, published in the Federal Register on August 26, 2011 (76 FR 53564).
- f) The State will comply with the requirements of any evaluation of the RTT-ELC program, or of specific activities it proposes to pursue as part of the program, conducted and supported by the Departments.

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name): Scott Walker	Telephone: 608-266-1212
Signature of the Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor :	Date:

The State must meet the following requirements to be eligible to compete for funding under this program:

(a) The Lead Agency must have executed with each Participating State Agency a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or other binding agreement that the State must attach to its application, describing the Participating State Agency’s level of participation in the grant. (See Part 6 of this application.) At a minimum, the MOU or other binding agreement must include an assurance that the Participating State Agency agrees to use, to the extent applicable--

- (1) A set of statewide Early Learning and Development Standards;
- (2) A set of statewide Program Standards;
- (3) A statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and
- (4) A statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

List of Participating State Agencies:

The applicant should list below all Participating State Agencies that administer public funds related to early learning and development, including at a minimum: the agencies that administer or supervise the administration of Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), the section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA programs, State-funded preschool, home visiting, Title I of ESEA, the Head Start State Collaboration Grant, and the Title V Maternal and Child Care Block Grant, as well as the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care, the State’s Child Care Licensing Agency, and the State Education Agency.

For each Participating State Agency, the applicant should provide a cross-reference to the place within the application where the MOU or other binding agreement can be found. Insert additional rows if necessary. The Departments will determine eligibility.

Participating State Agency Name (* for Lead Agency)	MOU Location in Application	Funds/Program(s) administered by the Participating State Agency
*Dept. of Children & Families	Part 6	* Child Care and Development Block Grant/ Wisconsin Shares, child care subsidy program, child care quality improvement *Child care regulation (licensing) *State & MIEC Home Visiting *State Advisory Council on Early Education & Care * Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) *Project LAUNCH *State General Purpose Revenue (GPR) *SAMHSA
Dept. of Health Services	Part 6	*Birth to 3 early intervention (IDEA Part C) *Title V, Maternal & Child Health Block Grant *Title XIX Medical Assistance *Interagency Coordinating Council *Project LAUNCH *Public Health/ Community Health Promotion *WIC nutrition program *Children & Youth with Special Health Care Needs *Autism Services

Participating State Agency Name (* for Lead Agency)	MOU Location in Application	Funds/Program(s) administered by the Participating State Agency
		*Mental Health Block Grant *State General Purpose Revenue (GPR) *SAMHSA grant funds *infant mental health
Dept. of Public Instruction	Part 6	State education agency: *IDEA, Part B Section 19 *ESEA Title I *4-year-old kindergarten (state-funded preschool) *Head Start state supplement *Head Start State Collaboration Grant *Child care food program *State General Purpose Revenue (GPR) *Local property tax revenue

(b) The State must have an operational State Advisory Council on Early Care and Education that meets the requirements described in section 642B(b) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b).

The State certifies that it has an operational State Advisory Council that meets the above requirement. The Departments will determine eligibility.

Yes

No

(c) The State must have submitted in FY 2010 an updated Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) State plan and FY 2011 Application for formula funding under the MIECHV program (see section 511 of Title V of the Social Security Act, as added by section 2951 of the Affordable Care Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-148)).

The State certifies that it submitted in FY 2010 an updated MIECHV State plan and FY 2011 Application for formula funding, consistent with the above requirement. The Departments will determine eligibility.

Yes

No

SECTION IV: APPLICATION

Part 1: State Plan Overview

- A. Provide an executive summary of the State’s Phase 2 RTT-ELC plan. Please include an explanation of why the State believes the activities in its Phase 2 plan will have the greatest impact on advancing its overall statewide reform plan.

Wisconsin’s Phase 1 application proposed an ambitious reform agenda that built on the State’s historic commitment to high quality early learning and development programs to improve child outcomes and the vision articulated in 2010 by the Wisconsin Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC). Its agenda advanced a vision of a strong early childhood system built on quality program standards embedded in a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS), comprehensive early learning and development standards; quality family engagement practices and supports, a comprehensive early childhood workforce development framework, and a strong assessment and accountability system.

The State’s reform agenda, as articulated in its 2011 application: (1) improves access to high quality early childhood and development programs by improving and expanding YoungStar; (2) implements an effective cross-sector early childhood professional development system; (3) strengthens family engagement and parent support strategies to improve children’s school readiness; (4) revises the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) and expands related training, coaching and mentoring activities; (5) pilots and implements a comprehensive kindergarten entry assessment; (6) accelerates expansion of the state’s longitudinal data system to include early childhood data; and (7) develops a public-private partnership to support system building.

Wisconsin is pleased to be provided with the opportunity to secure funding to advance this reform agenda in Phase 2. Given the challenge of a 50% reduction to its Phase 1 budget, the State is proposing a targeted reform agenda that builds on the significant progress the state has made since submitting its 2011 application. Progress made in the past year includes the following key accomplishments:

- Fully implemented the state TQRIS, YoungStar, including launch of a parent outreach campaign and provision of technical assistance to enrolled providers to improve quality;

- Created an Office of Early Learning at the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI);
- Continued expansion of the state-funded prekindergarten program, four year old kindergarten (4K), which is included in the state’s school funding formula. More than 90% of school districts currently operate this universal program, with approximately 25% of districts employing a community based model that embeds 4K in a child care or Head Start program.
- Passed legislation authorizing implementation of a statewide literacy assessment at kindergarten entry (11 Wisconsin Act 166) and a Read to Lead Development Fund administered by the Governor’s Office with a focus on expanding resources available for advancing children’s literacy;
- Developed recommendations related to the design and implementation of an integrated early childhood longitudinal data system (EC LDS);
- Developed and made significant progress in the build of a YoungStar data warehouse and related activities to improve data sharing capabilities between and among the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the Department of Health Services (DHS), and DPI; this includes receipt of a competitive federal grant that will institutionalize data sharing between DCF and DPI to better monitor and improve the educational outcomes of children in foster care;
- Developed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Head Start and the DCF Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare (BMCW), to improve access to quality services for children in foster care;
- Wisconsin’s ECAC issued its 2011 annual report, with recommendations that align with the state’s RTTT-ELC Phase 1 and Phase 2 application goals; and articulated operating principles and an organization structure that allows for active engagement of key stakeholders to inform ongoing early childhood system building efforts. DCF, DPI and DHS staff lead a steering committee inclusive of ECAC and other members, and oversee subcommittees formed to make recommendations in support of ECAC goals.
- Directed ECAC American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds to:
 - Support a Professional Development Consultant to align early childhood teaching preparation programs and professional development opportunities across sectors;
 - Enhance coaching and mentoring activities to assist programs in aligning curriculum with WMELS;
 - Establish a grant program to support early childhood system building, an effort that will inform the establishment of a public-private partnership to support this work;
 - Support pilot professional development initiatives in Milwaukee, targeting a provider cohort and supporting their movement from a 2- to a 3-star YoungStar rating;

- Support the completion of an early childhood Higher Education scan;
- Provide initial planning support for the YoungStar validation study; and
- Provide stipends to encourage early care providers to enroll in the Registry.

Despite this progress, Wisconsin continues to face challenges in providing high quality early learning and development experiences for its youngest and most at-risk citizens. For example, recent data from DCF indicate that 61% of child care programs enrolled in YoungStar (2,980 of 4,897) were rated at only a 2-star level, out of a 5-star rating scale. In addition, most children from low-income families who receive child care subsidies through the Wisconsin Shares program are being served in programs that are not providing the high quality learning environment that they need: 51% (20,734 of 40,607) of children with Wisconsin Shares authorizations were enrolled in 2-star programs.

Research shows that children with high needs who participate in high quality early learning and development programs are more likely to achieve developmental milestones and enter school ready to succeed. Therefore, Wisconsin's Phase 2 reform agenda will target resources to programs and providers who serve these children, so as to increase access to and improve the quality of programming these children receive and better prepare them for success at school entry.

To achieve this goal while accommodating reduced funding, Wisconsin's Phase 2 application addresses fewer selection criteria, with decisions to pursue criteria based on the following priorities:

- Increasing the supply of high quality early learning and development programs, especially for children whose care is subsidized by Wisconsin Shares;
- Helping families with high needs to access these programs;
- Improving data systems to inform policy and practice decisions; and
- Aligning efforts across early learning and development sectors to leverage and maximize resources.

The proposed goals and strategies that compose the reform agenda described in this application have been shaped by feedback from early childhood system stakeholders, including the Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC), co-chaired by the DCF Secretary and the DPI State Superintendent; as well as the Wisconsin Early Learning Coalition, Wisconsin's Disability Policy Partnership, and the Wisconsin Early Childhood Association.

In its Phase 2 application, Wisconsin chose to advance its reform agenda by addressing required investment areas A and B, and focused investment areas C (selection criteria 1 and 4), D(1), E(2), Competitive Preference Priority 2, and Investment Priority 5. The State chose not to address two selection criteria in Phase 2 that it has pursued in its 2011 application, based on limited resources, the

priorities listed above, and its current environment. These are selection criteria D(2), *Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills and abilities*, which the State did not address due to significant progress it has made in this area, both before and subsequent to its 2011 application; and E(1), *Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry (and the related Competitive Preference Priority 3)*, which the State did not address based on the passage of 11 Wisconsin Act 166, which mandates statewide implementation of a literacy assessment at kindergarten entry. As it implements this assessment, Wisconsin anticipates learning from progress made by other RTTT ELC states in this area in the future. A summary of each section is provided below, detailing where the proposed activities have been increased or reduced in Phase 2.

A(3). Developing the infrastructure necessary to implement the State's reform agenda

Wisconsin's Phase 2 governance and infrastructure for implementing its reform agenda is consistent with its Phase 1 application, building on a foundation of collaboration and shared governance across the participating state agencies and at the regional and local levels. A full-time grant manager employed by the state's lead agency, DCF, will ensure the successful implementation of this reform agenda, working with key managers across the participating state agencies and the ECAC. Tribal outreach and liaison services will ensure a coordinated approach to improving quality of tribal early learning and development programs statewide, and a public-private partnership will be seeded to aid in the sustainability of quality improvement activities.

(B)(1)-(5). Strengthening YoungStar - the state Tiered QRIS

Wisconsin will employ the following strategies to increase the number of high quality early learning and development programs as well as the number of participating children with high needs.

(B)(1) In its Phase 1 application, Wisconsin proposed to strengthen family engagement standards and increase training for child assessment available through YoungStar. Despite reduced funding in Phase 2, Wisconsin remains committed to reinforcing the areas of child assessment, inclusion and family engagement; however, these efforts will be reduced in scope and will focus on high need programs and the geographic areas with high concentrations of children with high needs. The state will leverage current resources to expand training and onsite technical assistance opportunities, and build its capacity to assist child care programs to better connect families with key inclusion services and supports such as Birth to 3, Early Childhood Special Education and the Regional Centers for Children with Special Health Care Needs.

(B)(2) Wisconsin's Phase 1 application focused on promoting participation of high needs families in YoungStar through increased marketing to programs. Since then, it has implemented an outreach campaign with this purpose. Phase 2 funding will support a communication campaign that targets high needs families including families using Wisconsin Works (W-2, Wisconsin's TANF program), families involved in the child welfare system and families at risk of being involved in the child welfare system. Wisconsin will focus outreach efforts on expanding the number of collaborative, community-based 4K programs that participate in YoungStar, building on alignment work that has occurred over the past year and continue ongoing outreach to Head Start and Early Head Start programs.

(B)(3) In Phase 1, Wisconsin proposed increasing DCF's capacity to train more individuals to implement Environment Rating Scales (ERS): i.e., using the infant – toddler scale (ITERS), Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS), and Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale (FCCRS). In light of reduced funding, Wisconsin is not allocating funds for this purpose in Phase 2, as the YoungStar Consortium currently has the capacity to meet training needs.

(B)(4) Wisconsin's Phase 1 application proposed activities to accelerate the pace at which programs advance in YoungStar by: expanding opportunities for Teacher Education And Compensation Helps (T.E.A.C.H.) scholarships to access credit based training, credentials and degrees; expanding training and technical assistance, coaching and mentoring for programs; developing communities of practice to better support providers; and providing quality and retention bonus incentives. Given the strong evidence base for education, training, technical assistance, coaching and mentoring, Wisconsin has elected to concentrate resources in these areas in its Phase 2 application, targeting activities to support programs serving the most concentrated numbers of children with high needs. The demand created by YoungStar implementation resulted in a 49% increase in T.E.A.C.H. scholarship awards this past year, and an anticipated shortfall in 2013 will result in a waiting list for the program. Tuition increases have also affected need. As such, Phase 2 proposes an increase in scholarship funding to targeted providers determined to improve the quality of their programs.

(B)(5) In Phase 2, Wisconsin remains committed to a full evaluation of YoungStar inclusive of Phase 1 activities. The state proposes using Environment Rating Scale (ERS), including the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) and the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale (FCCRS), as additional study outcomes, to validate program quality.

C(1) Effective application of the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards

To ensure that ELD providers have the skills and abilities to apply the WMELS in practice, Wisconsin's Phase 1 application proposed to (1) develop or expand training modules inclusive of each domain and sub-domain of child development in the WMELS; (2) expand the WMELS framework to align with the Common Core State Standards; (3) revise and validate the WMELS as needed to reflect evidence based practice; (4) expand regional and local capacity to deliver training to all early learning and development programs; and (5) use the Office of Early Learning to ensure consistent approaches in access, content and accountability via centralized and collaborative development of policies and local service delivery practices. Phase 2 builds on the existing cross-sector structure formed among DCF, DPI, and DHS under the auspices of the ECAC to assure the state has early learning standards and a system to deliver professional development and training, and targets activities that will increase training capacity and quality to high need populations and/or service areas.

C(4) Enhancing family engagement and support

In its Phase 1 application, Wisconsin proposed to develop family engagement program standards and training curricula in support of these standards; provide stipends to parents and community members to participate in the development of the family engagement program standards; launch a statewide communication campaign to promote the importance of quality early care and education; and hold family engagement trainings. In Phase 2, the State will build on the past year's progress within the state and across the nation on family engagement efforts. Phase 2 proposes to develop family engagement standards for YoungStar programs, building on and aligning with public 4K and 5K family engagement standards and the recently issued Head Start Family Engagement Framework; develop training curricula on practices in support of these standards; and provide training on the family engagement standards. Further, Wisconsin will target a media outreach campaign to high needs communities.

D(1) A great early learning and development workforce

To ensure the availability and retention of well-trained adults who have the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to effectively support the development of every child, with a focus on providers working with Wisconsin's children with highest needs, Wisconsin's Phase 1 application proposed to align educator preparation to Standards, develop a statewide early childhood workforce knowledge and competency framework, and develop a progression of credentials and degrees. Based on accomplishments of the past year, including an early childhood professional development scan and

higher education scan supported by ARRA ECAC funds, these continue to frame the Phase 2 application, which focuses on building the necessary infrastructure for these activities. Given the high number of low rated providers in YoungStar, these efforts intentionally support increased provider access to professional development, educational credentials and degrees that are needed to improve program quality. A cross sector professional development coordinator will lead cross system efforts related to credit alignment, early childhood licensing redesign, and career pathways in coordination with the ECAC's Professional Development subcommittee and the DPI Office of Early Learning. In addition, the regional training delivery structures that include regional coaches and action teams will be strengthened so as to leverage resources across systems.

(E2) Accelerating the development of an early childhood longitudinal data system

There is consensus in Wisconsin that, without an Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System (ECLDS), the state has little ability to evaluate its early childhood system building efforts or target resources effectively. Establishment of an ECLDS as an integrated information exchange over the siloed agency datasets is and continues to be considered a critical system need. Although much progress in terms of planning and ad hoc data sharing has been made over the past year, most of the "build" needs for the ECLDS remain. Reduced Phase 2 funding will leverage this progress, but also required reductions in scope, guided by state priorities to improve the quality of low-rated early learning and development programs and ensure that high needs children receive high quality care. Consequently, Phase 2 funding will support ways to connect data from YoungStar with education and health outcome data, and additional service participation data for the same children at DPI and DHS. It will also support efforts to strengthen and link related data systems at DCF, including YoungStar, Wisconsin Shares (Wisconsin's child care subsidy program), and Child Welfare.

In summary, Wisconsin believes that its Phase 2 application, as articulated above, continues to support its original vision of a strong early childhood system built on quality program standards embedded in a TQRIS, comprehensive early learning and development standards, quality family engagement practices and supports, a comprehensive early childhood workforce development framework, and a strong assessment and accountability system. By leveraging progress made over the past year and accommodating the reduced funding available in Phase 2 through careful targeting to highest needs areas and families, these high quality plans will have the greatest impact on advancing Wisconsin's overall statewide reform plan.

PART 2: Summary Table for Phase 2 Plan

The following table indicates the selection criteria addressed in Wisconsin’s Phase 2 application.

Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge	Addressed in 2011 application	Addressed in Phase 2 application
A. Successful State Systems		
(A)(1) Demonstrating past commitment to early learning and development.	X	X
(A)(2) Articulating the State’s rationale for its early learning and development reform agenda and goals.	X	X
(A)(3) Aligning and coordinating work across the State	X	X
(A)(4) Developing a budget to implement and sustain the work	X	X
B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs		
(B)(1) Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	X	X
(B)(2) Promoting participation in the State’s Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	X	X
(B)(3) Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs	X	X
(B)(4) Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs	X	X
(B)(5) Validating the State’s Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	X	X
C. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children		
(C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards	X	X
(C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems		
(C)(3) Identifying and addressing health, behavioral, and developmental needs		
(C)(4) Engaging and supporting families	X	X
D. A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce		
(D)(1) Developing Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials	X	X
(D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators	X	
E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress		
(E)(1) Understanding the status of children at kindergarten entry	X	
(E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system	X	X
Competitive and Invitational Priorities		
Competitive Priority 2: Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS	X	X
Competitive Priority 3: Understanding status of learning and development at Kindergarten Entry	X	
Invitational Priority 4: Sustaining Program Effects in the Early Elementary Grades		
Invitational Priority 5: Encouraging Private-Sector Support	X	X

Part 3: Narrative

In the text box below, the State must list the selection criteria from its FY 2011 application the State is proposing to address in Phase 2, the page reference from the FY 2011 application where the original plan for addressing the criterion can be found, and a narrative description of the Phase 2 plan to address that criterion.

The Phase 2 plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for each proposed activity. A Phase 2 applicant need not resubmit evidence from its FY 2011 application. If it chooses, a Phase 2 applicant may provide updated evidence if it supports the Phase 2 activities. Any new supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in an Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

For a full description of the selection criteria, please see Section VIII.

Selection criterion	A(3)	Page references from State’s FY11 application	88-97
----------------------------	-------------	--	--------------

Please explain how your State will address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.

Phase 1 Request: \$1,594,014
 Phase 2 Request: \$1,593,034

Wisconsin’s successful record of using a collaborative approach at the state, local and regional levels stands as described in its Phase 1 application, and provides a solid foundation for its Phase 2 reform agenda.

Consistent with Wisconsin’s Phase 1 application, the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the Governor’s designated lead agency, will act as the grant’s administrator, responsible for all fiscal, policy and program decisions specific to this application. Despite reduced funding, DCF will employ a full time grant manager whose primary responsibility is to ensure the successful implementation of Wisconsin’s Phase 2 reform agenda, as proposed in its Phase 1 application; however, the Program Assistant position has been eliminated. Costs budgeted to this section include 1 FTE grant manager (see p. 79, 82), required federal TA set-aside, funding for tribal early childhood outreach and liaison services and funding to seed the development of a public-private partnership as described in Invitational Priority 5 and allocated to that section in the Wisconsin’s Phase 1 application. (pp. 86,89)

New in Phase 2, DCF will assume responsibility for training and technical assistance activities aimed at improving child care provider’s competencies in the areas of inclusion and early intervention. DCF will contract for an Information Technology team to build additional data analytic capacity, merge

current data warehouses for separate programs, and provide centralized data able to be sent to other agencies; a Research Analyst will be employed to enhance DCF's ability to use its data to inform policy and practice decisions. DCF's roles and responsibilities as described in Phase 1 are consistent for Phase 2. DCF is responsible for administering the state's tiered QRIS, YoungStar, child care regulation, and the Wisconsin Shares subsidy program, and provides staffing for the ECAC. Current DCF staff, in partnership with proposed project positions, will advance the program and system improvements described in this Phase 2 application. (See pp. 70, 73, 82, 86, 89, 90, 92)

DPI's roles and responsibilities as described in Phase 1 have been reduced in scope from Wisconsin's Phase 1 application, while focusing resources on critical needed system building. Wisconsin will not pursue E(1), the development of a statewide, comprehensive kindergarten entry assessment. However, the state has made advances in this area, with the passing of 2011 Act 166, which mandates a statewide literacy assessment at school entry. Consistent with Phase 2 priorities, DPI will have lead responsibility for cross-sector professional development improvements aimed at improving program quality; for tribal outreach and liaison services to improve tribal early learning and development programs; and for project oversight for the development and implementation of an EC LDS, building on its current progress in implementing a K-12 LDS. Each of these activities has been scaled back from the State's Phase 1 application but are focused on critical system building needs. The Office of Early Learning (OEL) will employ a WMELS coordinator, contract for a Professional Development coordinator and act as fiscal agent for contracts to local and intermediary organizations for professional development, training and technical assistance activities. A Family Engagement consultant based at OEL will advance the development of aligned family engagement standards. DPI will contract for tribal early childhood outreach and liaison activities, coordinating between the participating state agencies and Wisconsin's tribal early learning and development programs. DPI will contract with an EC LDS project manager, who will oversee a cross-agency planning and implementation initiative that builds on current ongoing development work to ensure the EC LDS infrastructure is built and governed according to best practice standards. Finally, DPI will employ a research analyst who will contribute to DPI's ability to use its data to inform policy and practice decisions. (See pp. 70,74,80,82,85,87,89,90)

DHS' roles and responsibilities as described in Phase 1 have been reduced in scope from Wisconsin's Phase 1 application. In Phase 1, we proposed that DHS assume responsibility for training and technical assistance activities associated with health/wellness promotion, inclusion and early intervention competencies for early learning and development programs. In Phase 2, we are scaling back

this initiative to focus on YoungStar provider competency-building in these areas, and moving this responsibility to DCF, which administers the YoungStar program. In Phase 2, DHS will be responsible for building a customer hub across infant birth and death data within Vital Records; local health reporting data within the Secure Public Health Electronic Record (SPHERE), which includes state home visiting, Prenatal Care Coordination (PNCC), and maternal/child health program data; and the Wisconsin Immunization Registry (WIR). In addition, a Research Analyst will contribute to DHS’s ability to use its data to inform policy and practice decisions. (See pp.70, 75, 83, 88-89)

The governance-related roles and responsibilities specified in Wisconsin’s Phase 1 application remain unchanged in Phase 2, and are embodied in the enclosed MOU and preliminary Scope of Work. The governance and decision making roles and responsibilities of the lead and participating state agencies in Wisconsin’s Phase 2 application are consistent with those of its Phase 1 application. Stakeholder involvement, and in particular the role of the ECAC, in Wisconsin’s Phase 2 application are consistent with its Phase 1 application.

Wisconsin’s Phase 2 RTTT-ELC Participating State Agency Memorandum of Understanding is enclosed in Part 6 of this application.

Selection criterion	B(1)	Page references from State’s FY11 application	105-119
<p>Please explain how your State will address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.</p>			

Phase 1 Request: \$1,993,058¹
Phase 2 Request: \$ 748,000

In its Phase 1 application, Wisconsin proposed to strengthen family engagement standards and increase training for child assessment available through YoungStar, its Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS). Two FTE staff were proposed to increase connections to services and

¹ Please note that this number is \$2.1 million less than the \$4,093,058 presented for the B(1) funding request in the actual FY11 application. The \$2.1 million amount, intended to be contracted to DHS for connecting programs using the Master Client Index, was erroneously placed here rather than in the section E(2) budget (see page 289 of FY11 application).

supports around inclusion of all children and to focus on health needs; these positions were to have been located at DHS. Wisconsin has progressed significantly since the Round 1 application was submitted; there are now 4,265 programs participating and rated YoungStar, in addition to 632 programs that have a rating “pending”, including all programs that receive child care subsidy funding. As described in its Phase 1 application, Wisconsin’s system includes all of the required elements and the program standards identified in Table B(1)-1 remain the same.

Despite reduced funding, Wisconsin remains committed to reinforcing the areas of child assessment, inclusion and family engagement; however, these efforts will be reduced in scope to reflect less funding. In the past year, an extensive YoungStar data warehouse was built that provides the capacity to more precisely pinpoint the location of high need programs and the geographic areas with high concentrations of children with high needs. These data will help Wisconsin target its Phase 2 activities to achieve the greatest impact.

Since 2011, it has become evident that Wisconsin’s TQRIS requires administrative support to allow more time for program staff to work on critical YoungStar activities as well as continue to make connections to the work of early childhood system building that is housed under the umbrella of Wisconsin’s Early Childhood Advisory Council work. Therefore, for the project’s first five months, Wisconsin will utilize the support of an existing ARRA-funded administrative support position that has been assisting in the work of the ECAC and YoungStar. Subsequently, Phase 2 grant funds will be used to support this position. (See p. 83)

In Phase 1, Wisconsin proposed to increase providers’ use of comprehensive child assessments, by linking providers to existing opportunities, such as those available through Project Launch; providing additional training opportunities; and expanding the provision of onsite coaching and mentoring. For Phase 2, the frequency of training and onsite coaching and mentoring has been reduced to every other quarter. In addition, DCF will partner with DPI to ensure that high needs YoungStar providers and providers that have higher concentrations of high needs children will have priority access to these services and to related activities as described in sections C(1) and D(1). (See p. 86)

Goal B(1)(c)-A: Expand child care provider knowledge of comprehensive child assessments and communication with parents about assessment findings.																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Identify and link providers to existing child assessment training opportunities. <i>DCF & YoungStar Consortium</i>	◆		◆			◆		◆		◆		◆		◆		◆
Provide additional training as needed <i>DCF/ YoungStar, DPI and higher education partners</i> <i>Application cross-walk – C1</i>	◆	◆			◆				◆				◆			
Expand opportunities for onsite consultation, coaching and mentoring on child assessment practice and parent communication. <i>DCF/ YoungStar</i>		◆		◆		◆		◆		◆		◆				

In the area of family engagement, Phase 2 savings are realized by taking advantage of an evidence-based framework, the Head Start Parent, Community and Child Framework, and the addition of a family engagement position specific to YoungStar, as described in C(4).

Goal B(1)(c)-B: Strengthen family engagement standards in YoungStar.																
<i>Application Crosswalk: B3</i>																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Provide training for technical consultants on family engagement standards. <i>DCF and YoungStar Consortium</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆												
Explore the feasibility of a mandatory family engagement point for in YoungStar rating. <i>DCF/ YoungStar</i>					◆	◆	◆	◆								
Develop & implement targeted parent engagement outreach strategies (see (C)(4)) <i>DCF/ YoungStar and Regional staff</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

Wisconsin remains committed to focusing on building the capacity of providers to care for children with special needs. In round 1, Wisconsin proposed that two full time staff would be hired: one to work on physical health and wellness and another FTE to work on including children with special needs. Both of these FTE staff would have been based on the Department of Health Services.

Wisconsin’s Phase 2 application reduces funding for health promotion and inclusion staff, based on progress made in the state. Specifically, its Early Childhood Obesity Prevention Initiative

(WECOPI) has been very active in providing visibility for and training on early childhood health and wellness; it was a recipient of the First Lady’s “Weight of the Nation” award. Wisconsin’s Phase 2 request is reduced to include one staff position, a full time health promotion/inclusion consultant to be based at DCF to focus on child care programs remain the programs, which have the least resources to serve children with special needs. (See p. 79, 82) It is critical that child care programs are able to better connect families with key inclusion services and supports such as Birth to 3, Early Childhood Special Education and the Regional Centers for Children with Special Health Care Needs. This coordinator will work with the other participating state agencies to ensure that YoungStar providers are connected to existing training and supports, including training, coaching and mentoring activities described in C(1) and D(1) as well as current local resources.

Goal B(1)(c)- C: Strengthen training and technical assistance for providers serving special populations of children with high needs																
	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Hire staff <i>DCF/YoungStar</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Coordinate with DPI and DHS programs - Birth to 3, Early Childhood Special Education and the Regional Centers for Children with Special Health Care Needs. <i>DCF Inclusion Consultant with DPI and DHS</i>		◆		◆		◆		◆		◆		◆		◆		◆
Target additional technical for providers. <i>DCF Inclusion Consultant with DPI and DHS</i>		◆		◆		◆		◆		◆		◆				

Selection criterion	B(2)	Page references from State’s FY11 application	121-127
Please explain how your State will address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.			

Phase 1 Request: \$228,800
Phase 2 Request: \$180,000

In Phase 1, Wisconsin’s major emphasis was on promoting participation of high needs families in YoungStar through increased marketing to encourage more programs to participate. At the time of

submission, the YoungStar program was getting started and estimates had to be made about the number of programs participating and the kind of programs they were. We now have more precise data that is reflected in the updated Table B(2)(c) located in Part 4 of this application

The difference between the two tables is a more accurate count of Head Start programs, down from 204 to 136. In addition, the number of CCDF Funded programs is now more accurate with the specific number of 3,858 programs participating today. Lastly, the difference in the last column is that in the first round, DCF only counted all licensed programs. This updated chart reflects licensed and certified programs, which brings the total number of programs to 6,361 from 3,575. The target projections for participation in different star levels over the four years have been revised to reflect a more accurate understanding based on the program’s first year experience.

In addition, DCF successfully implemented a \$314,000 public education campaign to promote the program. Given less funding and progress made, DCF is proposing to use limited resources on a communication campaign that targets high needs families including families using W-2, families in Child Welfare and families at risk of being involved in the child welfare system. Note: this goal was originally placed in criterion B(3)-B but is more appropriately included here.

Goal B2-A: Increase the number of high needs families informed about and using YoungStar.																
<i>Application Crosswalk:B2</i>																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Targeted outreach to high needs families <i>DCF YoungStar</i>				◆				◆				◆				◆

Wisconsin will continue its efforts to bring more Head Start and Early Head Start programs into the YoungStar program as described in its Phase 1 application.

Since its Phase 1 submission, Wisconsin has made progress in aligning standards between YoungStar and collaborative 4K programs. With fewer available funds, Wisconsin will focus its efforts on expanding the number of collaborative community based 4K programs, encouraging their participation in YoungStar, in collaboration with existing partnerships.

Efforts since 2011 include the development of resource materials on the YoungStar website aimed at increasing participation. With more limited resources, Wisconsin will work with the DPI Superintendent’s 4K Task Force, a stakeholder group focused on building quality 4K programs. In collaboration with the Task Force, DCF will work to increase the number of collaborative 4K programs in Wisconsin and encourage their participation in YoungStar. (See pp. 86, 89)

Goal B2-B: Continue to expand collaborative 4K program																
<i>Application cross-walk – Competitive Priority 2</i>																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Expand community collaborative models <i>DCF & DPI</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆				
Work with 4K Task Force to encourage YoungStar participation. <i>DCF & DPI</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆				
Explore other state models that have developed alternate pathways for public pre-k programs <i>DCF & DPI</i>			◆	◆	◆	◆										
Determine feasibility and cost/benefit of proposed alternatives and make recommendations to DPI for an alternate path <i>DCF & DPI</i>							◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆				

Selection criterion	B(3)	Page references from State’s FY11 application	129-134
Please explain how your State will address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.			

Phase 1 Request: \$626,000

Phase 2 Request: 0

In Phase 1, Wisconsin proposed increasing DCF’s capacity to train more individuals in Environment Rating Scale (ERS) – using the infant – toddler scale (ITERS), Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS), and Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale (FCCRS), at an average cost of \$4,500 a person for 28 people or \$126,000. In light of reduced funding, Wisconsin is not allocating funds for this purpose in Phase 2, as the YoungStar Consortium currently has the capacity to meet training needs for ERS.

In its Phase 1 application a B(3) chart was included, related to engaging families in YoungStar; this more appropriately belongs in B(1) and has been moved to that section in this Phase 2 application.

Selection criterion	B(4)	Page references from State's FY11 application	136-147
Please explain how your State will address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.			

Phase 1 Request: \$9,333,000

Phase 2 Request: \$8,364,000

Wisconsin's Phase 1 application proposed activities to accelerate the pace at which programs advance in YoungStar by: expanding opportunities for T.E.A.C.H. scholarships for accessing credit based training, credentials and degrees; expanding training and technical assistance for programs; developing communities of practice to better support providers; and providing quality and retention bonus incentives. Given the strong evidence base for education, training, technical assistance, coaching and mentoring, Wisconsin has elected to concentrate resources in these areas in its Phase 2 application.

The related performance measure charts, (B) (4) (c) (1) and (B) (4) (c) (2) are located in Part 4 of this application. They have been revised based on the State's experience implementing and operating YoungStar in 2011. At the time Wisconsin's Phase 1 application was submitted, the state was estimating numbers of programs at star levels because the program was just beginning and data wasn't available. The estimates in the current charts are based on actual numbers and reflect a year's worth of data and more sophisticated projections based on operational analyses.

More accurate data has also allowed Wisconsin to understand emerging patterns more precisely. One clear pattern in 2011-2012 is that there are more two star providers than anticipated, reinforcing the need for increased access to education and support to move providers up the star levels. Providers are not earning education points because of lack of access to and utilization of credit-based education opportunities.

Using a more targeted understanding of where high needs children are and where high needs providers are offering services, in Phase 2 the state will be able to more precisely target how to deliver and support programs serving the most concentrated numbers of children with high needs. The demand created by the implementation of YoungStar resulted in a 49% increase in T.E.A.C.H. scholarship awards. An increase in scholarship funding relative to Phase 1 is being requested to meet this growing

demand, as evidenced by an anticipated shortfall in 2013 that will result in a waiting list for the program. This challenge is further exacerbated by tuition increases.

As a result of the significant need for this area of support for providers, gains made in other aspects of the RTTT-ELC application, coupled with the higher demand for education - as evidenced by the waiting list anticipated in early 2013 – Wisconsin’s Phase 2 application reflects an increase of \$1 million for scholarships. (See p. 92) DCF will use data about where 2 star programs are concentrated and specifically target these additional resources to those programs. At the 2 star level, programs that have asked for a technical rating – requiring a program visit and asking for technical assistance as opposed to an automated rating which results in no technical assistance – will receive greater consideration for these additional scholarship opportunities. DCF will also determine which programs are motivated and poised to move beyond 3 stars as an additional consideration in making scholarship decisions.

Goal B(4)-A: Accelerate the number of degreed teachers in the early childhood workforce by expanding educational opportunities to Wisconsin’s early care workforce																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Identify high needs areas for provider education/credentialing using targeted data on 2 star providers. <i>DCF</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Expand availability of T.E.A.C.H.® scholarships to diverse providers. <i>DCF</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

Another need that has emerged over the past year is the need to increase DCF’s capacity to meet the professional development needs of child care providers. In Phase 2, Wisconsin proposes to hire 2 FTE professional development staff to assist in better analyzing the provider data and offering tailored technical assistance, coaching and mentoring. (See pp. 79, 82) The state also proposes additional technical assistance, on-site coaching and mentoring hours to increase the YoungStar Consortium’s capacity to meet provider needs. (See p. 87, 89)

The Phase B(4) -B goal is revised to reflect these adjusted goal and activities.

Goal B(4)-B: Expand training and technical assistance to expand competencies of the early care workforce in YoungStar

Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Hire two FTE staff	◆															
Ensure expanded training, technical assistance, coaching and mentoring efforts provide access to WMELs training, Pyramid model training and family engagement training. Cross walk with (C)(1) and (4) <i>DC, with DPI and DCF</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Target and increase technical assistance to programs, including self-assessment, career counseling, quality improvement programming, business practices and related training and technical assistance needs. <i>DCF YoungStar</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

In light of reduced funding, in lieu of developing a separate Community of Practice as was proposed in Goal B4-3 (page 141) in Round 1, DCF will coordinate with DPI to ensure that technical consultants are included in efforts described to develop Communities of Practice described in C4 and D.

Goals B4-(4) & (6) have been adjusted to reflect reduced funding for quality and retention bonuses. Wisconsin elected to reduce this funding because, while incentives are an attractive bonus to providers, there is no current evidence base that supports these benefits (above and beyond the already elevated reimbursement levels associated with quality offered within the TQRIS) will actually assist programs to improve and maintain quality; as such, this initiative will be closely monitored. DCF will distribute one-time retention bonuses to child care providers who have moved up the quality rating scale and report on the outcome over the project’s initial three years, as follows (reflects reduced funding):

- 600 2-Star programs at \$500
- 200 3-Star programs at \$1,000
- 76 4-Star Programs at \$1,500

(See p. 87, 89).

DCF will target these limited quality and retention bonuses by priority identified highest need areas of the state. Policies will be developed that clearly articulate a length of time when a program must remain at a star level before it qualifies for a bonus as well as other details about how the bonuses will be administered.

Goals B4-(4) & (6): Provide incentives to providers that progress to higher YoungStar QRIS levels.																
<i>Application Crosswalk (B)(4)</i>																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Distribute bonuses to targeted, eligible providers <i>DCF</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆				

In light of significant investments in YoungStar’s communication campaign and the earlier goal described in B (2) that targets high needs families in YoungStar, the Phase 2 application does not include significant investments in a communication campaign, as proposed in Phase 1.

Selection criterion	B(5)	Page references from State’s FY11application	148-156
Please explain how your State will address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.			

Phase 1 Request: \$550,000
Phase 2 Request: \$625,000

Wisconsin remains committed to a full evaluation of the YoungStar program that includes efforts described in Phase 1 to ensure that a full sample size is supported by supplementing its original financial commitment to evaluating YoungStar with RTTT-ELC funds. Wisconsin also proposes using the Environment Rating Scale (ERS), which includes the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale and Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale, as an additional study outcome, as validation of quality in the programs where children are being assessed. This includes working on the goals articulated for B(5) in the Phase 1 application. DCF will explore the feasibility of developing a parent survey separately. (See p. 87, 89)

Selection criterion	C(1)	Page references from State’s FY11 application	158-165
Please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.			

Phase 1 Request: \$2,962,700

Phase 2 Request: \$ 802,000

In Wisconsin’s Phase 1 application, this section described the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS) and the structure in place to assure the state has early learning standards and a system to provide professional development to the early childhood workforce. The application described the WMELS’s five domains, how it applies to programs serving children from birth to first grade, the train-the-trainer module for professional development, the regional implementation structure with coaches, coordinators and trainers, and cross sector alignment that is the foundation. WMELS are aligned with the state’s K-12 education standards, and outline what children need to know and be able to do across the key domains of early childhood development and across the infant/toddler and preschool years. In YoungStar, providers earn points in the Learning Environment and Curriculum category for completing WMELS training and aligning their curricula with these standards. The application also described, in sections C(1) and D, other domain content areas, including the Pyramid Model for Social and Emotional Foundations. Finally, the Phase 1 application described the Office of Early Learning, which subsequently was created at DPI. The OEL is the fiscal agent for the braided funding initiative that has allowed the three state departments to jointly fund common structures and/or initiatives across early learning and development sectors.

In its 2011 application, Section C(1) described the vision and challenges faced by the State, including:

- Existing personnel (process and content coordinators, regional coaches, trainers) resources are at capacity and unable to take on new areas.
- Increased need for training due to successful promotion of WMELS alignment and YoungStar.
- A variety of topics were identified for professional development modules and need to be aligned to a common message and framework.
- Cross sector and community implementation models are important but difficult to sustain.

- Demonstrated need for a consistent approach to access, content, and accountability across sectors, yet no recognized structure to move the policy, process and practice issues forward.

Wisconsin's Phase 1 application proposed \$2.9 million in four activity areas:

- Standards and structure
- Early literacy and alignment with Common Core State Standards (CCSS)
- Expanding training modules, and
- Technical assistance structures: coaching, mentoring, and community of practice.

Over the past year, Wisconsin has continued to work to build, implement, and improve the implementation of WMELS through a professional development structure across state, regional, and local levels. These accomplishments inform its revised request for Phase 2. They continue to form the basis for the budget request, which has been reduced. Revised Phase 2 activities and strategies are based on the overall priorities for Phase 2, with these additional considerations:

- Expand on accomplishments since Phase 1.
- Increase access to WMELS and Pyramid Model training and follow-up in targeted high need areas in order to increase child care quality of and improve the program's YoungStar rating level.
- Eliminate the original proposal for part time coaches and coordinators to become full time and focus on coordinator positions.
- Reduce the number of domain content modules that are developed.

Phase 2 builds on the existing cross-sector structure that has been formed among DCF, DPI, and DHS to assure the state has early learning standards and a system to deliver professional development and training. Phase 2 activities target increased opportunities for training to high need populations and/or service areas. Details provided below for each Activity include: the Phase 1 strategy, the rationale and specific change for Phase 2, as well as the strategies for implementation.

Activity 1 Focus: the existing WMELS professional development infrastructure

Phase 1: work with the new Office of Early Learning (OEL) and the braided funding initiative by making coaches and coordinators into full time project positions to full develop the structure to assure quality professional development.

Phase 2: work with the OEL to focus on system development and coordination with sections B, D, and the ECAC to accomplish the work. Expansion of collaboration coaches' time was removed from this application but will continue to be a desired goal of the braided funding initiative.

Rationale: strategies have been scaled back to reflect the funding and time allocated for the Coordinator. The Phase 2 priority to focus on improving YoungStar-enrolled child care provider quality and children with high needs also influenced the decision to reduce funding for targeted trainers. Our lessons learned about evidence based professional development drive the focus on trainer coaching, mentors, and related professional development strategies.

Activity 1 Strategies:

- Increase WMELS Coordinator time to support work through the Office of Early Learning (OEL) to build the structure for a cross department professional development hub and accomplish strategies identified in this application to support the emphasis on targeted training, and revisions/additions to the content to ensure the child care workforce, school districts, and other early care and education providers can put the content into everyday practice. The coordinator also manages trainer structures/stipends, oversees training and reporting, informs coaches and coordinators, oversees content and revisions to WMELS and training materials, and works with other coordinators. The stipend program will be fully implemented and a plan for on-site follow-up training will be designed and implemented.
- Provide additional contracts or personnel service contracts with trainers to target high need areas of training and onsite support.
- Support the purchase of new materials for trainer kits and new ways of disseminating training packages.

Activity 2 Focus: Revisions of the current WMELS related to early literacy and align them with DPI's Common Core State Standards (CCSS)

Phase 1: focused significant funding to review and revise the early literacy section of the WMELS. These revisions were to support the work of the Governor's Read to Lead Task Force and would align the existing standards with evidence based terminology and strategies.

Phase 2: recognizes several significant accomplishments related to this area:

- The WMELS early literacy section was revised and is being distributed as a side-by-side document.
- The WMELS were aligned with the CCSS reading and math sections. This alignment is being shared with districts and communities. A printed side-by-side version and/or incorporation into the WMELS document are still needed.

- The DPI created and is promoting “the Wisconsin Model for Response to Intervention: Application in Early Childhood Settings,” which also promotes the role of state standards in guiding instruction and assessment.
- An early literacy screening (PALS) is being implemented for all five-year-old kindergarten students. This screening program will also provide technical assistance on evidence based early literacy instructional practices.
- These efforts have resulted in increased interest in school districts and community programs in WMELS and demonstrated the need for support to districts on how to align WMELS and CCSS on the local level.

Rationale: refocused from making revisions to aligning and increasing the resources and training content related to early literacy within the process of standards, instruction, and assessment.

Activity 2 Strategies:

- Create a consistent literacy instruction module. The coordinator will work with DPI staff developing the literacy training, the Response to Instruction (RTI) coordinator, and assessment initiatives to support the creation of a common, evidence based training on early literacy instruction.
- Phase 2 funding will provide consultant and related financial support for to this project.

Activity 3 Focus: Expand Content Specific and Targeted Training Modules

Phase 1: proposed, in coordination with Section B and D, to expand the number and scope of content training modules available in each of the WMELS domains, building capacity to deliver trainings across the state and consistent approaches to trainers and program mentoring. Experience with this project shows this model to be highly successful in changing environmental practices, resulting in increased YoungStar points. Over the last year, Wisconsin has completed the SEFEL Pyramid Model Demonstration Project as a means to increase training and improve practices in the domain of social and emotional development. DPI has committed to support sustaining this effort through a coordinator contract to CESA 11, the project lead.

Phase 2: the primary focus is narrowed to Enhance Pyramid Model pilot program mentoring and explores how to expand the external coaching mentoring model to child care and other early learning programs that have consistent training in the Wisconsin Pyramid Model and are ready to move to program wide implementation.

Activity 3 Strategies:

- Provide additional time for Pyramid Model training coordinators to provide targeted Pyramid Model training and coaching model in targeted high need areas. The two Pyramid Model coordinators will consider how to redesign the structure to increase general training with a structure that supports external coaching.

Activity 4 Focus: Strengthen technical assistance structures for coaching and community of practices (in coordination with Section B and D) by providing coaching/mentoring to individuals who complete the training, to assist them to apply training to practice/help with curriculum alignment. Enhance the current professional development infrastructure so as to better support coaches/mentors and trainers working with providers.

Phase 1: proposed to assure adequate numbers of qualified WMELS trainers though the implementation of a structure to support and enhance recruitment, provide mentoring and support for trainers through the existing regional collaboration coach trainer process, mentor stipends, and communities of practice.

Phase 2: refocuses this activity to pilot processes that enable mentors to go on-site into programs to model activities and supports for intentional services. On-site supports also will provide targeted training to staff creating lesson plans that deliver activities aligned with the WMELS and/or to establish local procedures for aligning WMELS with Common Core State Standards.

Activity 4 strategies include:

- Expand and sustain efforts to identify and sustain high quality trainer cadre: stipend and mentor program to assure adequate trainers to address the need.
- Expand the current stipend program to include additional WMELS and Pyramid Model trainers.
- Expand the program mentoring program to focus on WMELS and/Pyramid Model.
- Add to Tribal consultant contract [see A(3)] for increased access to WMELS and Pyramid training and communities of practice.

(See pp. 87, 89 for a summary of these contracts)

Goal 1: Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children through expansion of the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards Professional Development Structure <i>Application Crosswalk: (C)(1)(a)-(d)</i>																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Develop the WMELS professional development <i>DPI OEL</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Early Literacy resources and professional development <i>DPI OEL</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Focus on Social and Emotional Domain through Pyramid Model <i>DPI OEL</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Strengthen technical assistance structures for coaching and community of practices for WMELS <i>DPI OEL</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

Selection criterion	C(4)	Page references from State’s FY11 application	170-178
Please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.			

Phase 1 Request: \$5,519,197
Phase 2 Request: \$1,213,000

One of the most effective means of ensuring academic success is to engage families in their children’s learning. Wisconsin remains committed to developing family engagement standards for YoungStar programs. In its Phase 1 application, Wisconsin proposed to (1) hire a family engagement consultant to develop family engagement program standards and training curricula in support of these standards; (2) provide stipends to parents and community members to participate in the development of the family engagement program standards; (3) launch a statewide communication campaign to promote the importance of quality early care and education; (4) hold family engagement trainings; (5) hire a performance planner for program evaluation; and (6) evaluate the effectiveness of trainings on children’s school readiness.

In its Phase 2 application, Wisconsin proposes to (1) hire a 1.0 FTE DCF family engagement consultant to develop family engagement program standards for YoungStar and training curricula in support of these standards; (2) hire a 0.5 FTE DPI family engagement consultant to align public 4K and

5K family engagement standards with Head Start and YoungStar family engagement standards; (3) provide training on the family engagement standards supported by a Community of Practice; and (4) target a media outreach campaign to high needs communities. (See pp.80, 82, 87, 89, 90, 91)

Wisconsin will build on the progress made in the past year both within the state and across the nation on family engagement efforts. Since the time of the FY 11 application, an extensive YoungStar public education campaign was implemented and is described in Section B(2); the Head Start/Early Head Start Parent, Family, Community Engagement Framework and Head Start/Early Head Start Relationship-Based Competencies were issued; and an ECAC project team on Family and Community Partnerships was established. This team has worked to articulate a vision for family and community engagement to elevate and highlight critical components of a strong family and community framework for children in Wisconsin.

In light of the reduction in funding, the Phase 2 application proposes to hire a DCF family engagement consultant to develop a progression of standards for family engagement that will be used to determine mandatory points in YoungStar on family engagement across star levels. The standards will be aligned, as appropriate, with the Head Start family engagement standards and the Strengthening Families framework. Training curricula and implementation resources will be developed for the early learning programs. Since the YoungStar family engagement standards will be aligned with the Head Start/Early Head Start Parent, Family, Community Engagement Framework and the Head Start/Early Head Start Relationship-Based Competencies, and parent/community member input was included in the development of these resources, funds proposed in the Phase 1 application for standards development are reduced and stipends for advisory council participation, focus and work groups are eliminated.

A DPI family engagement consultant in the Office of Early Learning will be hired to facilitate utilization of the family engagement standards used in Head Start/Early Head Start and YoungStar in 4K and 5K programs. Research suggests that the short-term gains made by children attending high quality early education can be lost upon school entry. The DPI family engagement consultant will provide assistance in supporting families during the transition from early learning settings to kindergarten and support development of a comprehensive birth-to-third grade early learning and development system. The DPI family engagement consultant will coordinate efforts with the DCF family engagement consultant, the DPI K-12 family/community partnership coordinator, and DHS to integrate family engagement strategies into other early learning and development programs, as appropriate.

The family engagement performance planner proposed in Phase 1 and the funds for evaluation of

the effectiveness of family engagement on children's school readiness are eliminated. Tools provided in the Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Framework will be used to collect and analyze data for improvements in the implementation of the YoungStar family engagement standards.

In the Phase 2 application, professional development training to child care providers on the YoungStar family engagement program standards will be delivered in each of the five YoungStar regions of the state. Each region will provide twenty trainings per year. Three trainers for the Head Start/Early Head Start Statewide Office will support the development of a cross system training that includes the Head Start Parent, Family and Community Engagement Framework and the YoungStar family engagement program standards. The seven family outcomes from the Head Start Parent, Family and Community Engagement Framework align with the five protective factors from Strengthening Families framework and training is currently being provided connecting the two frameworks within the context of YoungStar. The three Head Start trainers will share responsibility for delivery of the training and supporting the development of additional trainers.

In the Phase 2 application the scope of the Communities of Practice is reduced. Each of the five regions will have one Community of Practice to build on the professional development training for child care providers. The Community of Practice meetings will occur monthly in a combination of face-to-face and technology-supported venues to provide the opportunities to share implementation of the family engagement standards in the programs. The DCF family engagement consultant will be responsible for planning and coordinating these meetings.

Since the Phase 1 application, DCF successfully implemented a public education campaign as described in Section B (2). The amount of funding targeted to the statewide communication campaign will be reduced and targeted to high need communities. In addition to the funds proposed in Section B (2) for targeted outreach to high needs families in W-2 and the child welfare system, these funds will promote the importance of high quality early learning programs through the following strategies: billboards, bus plaques, health care providers (physical, mental and behavioral), faith-based organizations, homeless shelters, domestic violence shelters, WIC sites, hair and nail salons, barber shops, laundry mats, grocery stores and community centers. Wisconsin will build on the work already done in other states in developing communication campaigns on the importance of early care and education. Other states were contacted to inquire about the possibility of adapting their communication programs, and Wisconsin will continue to pursue creative means of distributing messages regarding the importance of high quality early learning and development programs.

Following are the adjusted Gantt charts for the Phase 2 application:

Goal (C)(4)(a): Develop a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of the Program Standards to enhance children’s school readiness.																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Hire a DCF Family Engagement Consultant (FEC). <i>Responsible Party: DCF</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Hire a DPI Family Engagement Consultant (FEC) <i>Responsible Party: DPI</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Convene a workgroup of parents, early childhood educators and community members <i>DCF FEC with DPI FEC & DHS</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆												
Develop, align and implement family engagement program standards for YoungStar, <i>DCF FEC with DPI FEC & DHS.</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Create and implement a communication plan the community <i>DCF FEC.</i>			◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

Goal (C)(4)(b): Train early learning and development providers, staff and administrators on culturally competent, evidence-based strategies to engage and support families, targeting families of children with high needs.																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Assess current available training and technical assistance. <i>DCF and DPI Family Engagement Consultants(FEC)</i>	◆															
Design a staff development plan. <i>DCF FEC</i>		◆	◆	◆												
Develop and pilot cross discipline training on culturally competent, trauma informed family engagement and support strategies. <i>DCF FEC with DPI FEC & DHS</i>			◆	◆	◆											
Train staff and administrators <i>DCF FEC with DPI and DHS</i>					◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Embed family engagement and support in the YoungStar program using Community of Practice. <i>DCF FEC with DPI FEC & DHS</i>				◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

Selection criterion	D(1)	Page references from State's FY11 application	180-195
<p>Please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.</p>			

Phase 1 Request: \$225,000

Phase 2 Request: \$740,000

The Phase 2 section D(1) provides a revised set of strategies to address workforce quality within the existing structure as defined in Phase 1, redistributing resources to emphasize the need for professional development system building. Below are the foundation areas described and a brief update on the accomplishments in the past year.

- **Core Knowledge & Competencies:** Existing Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards defining what child from birth to 1st grade should know and be able to do. For the social and emotional domain, the Pyramid Model initiative is effective in provide standards, best practices, and for this domain. See section C(1). In 2007, the Professional Development Initiative (PDI) developed cross sector competencies” *Core Competencies for Professionals Working with Young Children and Their Families*”. In 2012, the new PDI group has committed to review and revise these competencies to bring them in line with cross sector efforts and changes to teacher licensing. Other efforts include aligning standards for screening and assessment and data. (See section C(1).
- **Qualification, Licensure & Certification:** The DCF Child Care Registry and the state Educator Licensing System/ DPI Teacher Licensing already provide a progression of credentials and degrees. The DPI and Registry staff have begun to explore how the data structures work together to support data sharing and data driven decision making
- **Pathways & Progression:** The Registry system is progressive from the lowest qualification through higher levels that include the highest levels in teacher licensing. The State PK-12 Multi-Tiered Educator Licensing System Progression provides a progression from initial teacher to Master teacher. These systems have a long history of work to create pathways. We have articulation agreements between 2 and 4 year universities and a variety of other efforts that promote the development of pathways. We are up-dating our on-line career guide.
- **Professional Development Structure:** Postsecondary institutions and other professional development

providers are being aligned through common professional development vision, networking, team work, braided funding, and shared opportunities.

- Postsecondary Engagement: Two and four year faculty at WI IHE are involved through the TA network We are completing a higher education scan.
- Incentives and Rewards and Data: These two key features of a professional development foundation are addressed in sections B and E, where the focus and updates are detailed.

Section D(1) also builds on the existing structure referenced in C(1) and B that support the cross-sector professional development among DCF, DPI, and DHS. Section D(1) supports the articulation of preservice higher education at the 2- and 4-year institutions and among the child care Registry System and the state teacher licensing system. It addresses high need targets by proving pathways for provider progression up the educational levels of the career path, by assuring professional development content in areas specifically related to high need populations, and by building the skills and knowledge of the professional development workforce to relate to this content. This section also aligns with B(2) and C(1) with an emphasis on creation of a comprehensive screening and assessment system and promotion of 4K community approaches alignment with YoungStar. It incorporates concepts from the round 1 Kindergarten Entrance Assessment as professional development and YoungStar targeting.

Phase 1 defined three areas for next steps: align educator preparation to Standards (quality plan), develop a statewide early childhood workforce knowledge and competency framework [D(1)(a)], and develop a progression of credentials and degrees [D(1)(b)]. Based on accomplishments and experiences of the past year, these will continue to frame the Phase 2 application. The following criteria informed decisions about how to reframe this section:

- Success in educator program alignment allows Wisconsin to move the target
- Focus on trainers who represent high need target areas
- Move some Phase 1 system building concepts into Phase 2 Section D(1) to reflect the continued importance of a system approach, addressed from the professional development perspective (e.g. Wisconsin is not writing to E(1) in Phase 2 but will be assessment will be addressed by training school districts on assessment practices.
- Learn from and build on other cross system professional development efforts including the IDEA State Personnel Development Grant and the ECAC Professional Development Project Team.

The Phase 1 application reported that the State conducted a professional development policy scan in 2010 to identify areas of greatest need and next steps in the system building process. Using NAEYC's *Policy Blueprint* as a guide, the State identified a set of emerging opportunities in each policy area as well as a list of recommendations, discussed below. In September 2012, the State convened a meeting of TA providers to share information, resources, update this work and provide input for this application. Wisconsin has a vision and requires personnel and mechanisms to move forward.

The Phase 2 focus for this section is based upon the foundational position of an Aligned Professional Development coordinator who will be the primary implementer of Phase 2 strategies. (See pp. 87, 89) The PD Coordinator position will: coordinate PD function of coaches, credit alignment, early childhood licensing redesign, pathways, in-service alignment. Phase 2 infuses new effort into braided funding of regional coaches and the action team structure, enhances the role of the coaches in professional development processes at the regional level, works with other coordinators to assure professional development alignment, works across departments on competencies and pathways, and coordinates state level networks, aligned professional development efforts, credit alignment, early childhood licensing redesign, pathways, in-service alignment and credit for prior learning opportunities. These strategies intentionally support child care providers to better understand opportunities for targeted professional development that can lead to credits, credentials and degrees.

Another common strand is that strategies 1 and 2 below will be implemented in conjunction with the ECAC Professional Development Initiative (PDI) Project Team, which evolved from the Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners PD initiative over the past year. The work defined in the ECAC Project Team aligns with the activities described in this application.

Activity 1. Lead efforts to implement a statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes while supporting the workforce with evidence based, coaching, mentoring, and communities of practice. The PD coordinator will:

- Organize and host meetings of the PDI
- Coordinate with the Regional Collaboration Coaches to keep them organized and up-to-date on professional development within their regions
- Document and reflect the changes to the WI framework based on the Professional Development & Higher Education Scans, and Career Guide updates

- Develop a statewide technical assistance network to promote alignment, resource sharing, and promising practices within the framework of trainers, coaching, mentoring, on-site follow-up and other roles.
- Work through OEL to develop a structure for the PDI initiative and ongoing input into teacher licensing and the Registry: give input to DPI related to early childhood program review, revision of preparation requirements, data sharing, framework development, and develop a common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Activity 2. Provide workforce professional development training and technical assistance structures to assure a comprehensive and consistent approach to content related to standards including: early learning, classroom environment, and screening/assessment. The PD Coordinator will:

- Continue to organize and provide financial support to the state T/TA meeting to assure quality and knowledgeable content trainers to promote alignment, resource sharing, parent engagement, and promising
- Collaborate with the Regional Coaches to organize their meetings to support communication on the wide range of professional development issues
- Coordinate alignment of several professional development modules related to inclusion of children with disabilities, dual language learners, culturally responsive practices, and homelessness.
- Develop new training modules including early learning standards, Pyramid Model, screening/assessment, inclusive practices for children with disabilities, homelessness, and dual language learners.

Activity 3. Coordinate with section B(2) to promote a 4-year-old kindergarten community approach as a means to improve quality and increase number of 4K classrooms rated highly by YoungStar. The existing 4K Coach will receive additionally funded days to:

- Work with DCF and other related coordinators to bring a professional development focus on Environment Rating Scale (ERS), program evaluation, ongoing and comprehensive assessment, response to intervention, and standards alignment to school districts across the state in relationship to 4K programs.

- Work between DCF and the 4K and YoungStar alignment to the State Superintendent’s Advisory Committee on Four-Year-Old kindergarten and Community Approach to establish guidance for align and/or inclusion in YoungStar.
- Promote creating and sustaining four-year-old kindergarten community approach models.

(See pp. 80, 82)

1) Align educator preparation program requirements to the Common Core State Standards and new state literacy recommendations.																
Application Crosswalk (D)(1)(a)																
Key Activities (in alignment with B & C)	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Revise and design statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework <i>DPI/PDI</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Support Trainer and Technical Assistance Providers, coaches, mentors, and regional personnel <i>DPI/PDI</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Target TA: 4 year-old-kindergarten and YoungStar <i>DPI r 4Kca</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

Selection criterion	E(2)	Page references from State’s FY11 application	225-242
Please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this criterion in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.			

Phase 1 Request: \$15,790,077²
Phase 2 Request: \$ 8,434,968

Wisconsin collects a wealth of information about young children, early childhood programs, and educators; however, this information (from over 37 programs) is housed in multiple silo-ed datasets across multiple state agencies. Currently, the State has little capacity to connect early childhood data across programs and services, track children’s progress over time, or use data to assess the State’s early childhood system. Writing to selection criterion (E)(2) was optional in the Fiscal Year 2011 (FY11) application; however, there was consensus that without an Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System

² Please note that this number is \$2.1 million larger than the \$13,690,077 presented for the E2 funding request in the actual FY11 application. The \$2.1 million amount, intended to be contracted to DHS for connecting programs using the Master Client Index, was erroneously placed in the section B budget (see page 289 of FY11 application).

(ECLDS), the state would have little ability to evaluate its early childhood system building efforts or target resources effectively. Therefore, establishment of an ECLDS as an integrated information exchange over the silo-ed agency datasets was considered a crucial piece of the system that needed to be funded.

At the time of the Phase 1 application, an interdepartmental Project Team had begun planning for a feasibility study and established a Project Charter signed by the administrators of the three partnering agencies (Department of Children and Families [DCF], Department of Public Instruction [DPI], and Department of Health Services [DHS]); however, little concrete progress had been made in terms of actual building of the system. In the FY11 application, **\$15,790,077** was budgeted to complete the following key activities:

- Establish and employ a permanent, full-time ECLDS Project Manager
- Establish and employ a permanent, full-time ECLDS Research Analyst
- Establish and employ ECLDS Data Analysts at each PSA
- Establish ECLDS Advisory Group; solicit, and apply feedback from Group
- Define and establish structures and policies to identify and implement the first crucial Essential Data Elements and linkages
- Define and establish structures and policies to identify and implement Data System Oversight Requirements
- Develop MOUs between DPI, DCF, and DHS re: data sharing, data governance, quality assurance
- Implement programming and infrastructure upgrades needed to align data collection standards and create efficient and reliable interoperability between PSA data systems
- Begin building reporting processes and analytical capacity, to answer key policy questions
- Develop training for system users
- Address data gaps
- Increase access to and usefulness of data at local level, and provide training for system users
- Plan for and incorporate statewide kindergarten readiness assessment data
- Explore options for enhancing system to include case management capabilities

Even without Phase 1 funding, the Wisconsin ECLDS project has continued to move forward, and “improving data systems that inform policy and practice decisions” was identified as a key priority for Wisconsin’s Phase 2 application. As a result, consensus to pursue (E)(2) remains, but at a reduced

funding level.

Although much progress in terms of project planning and *ad hoc* data sharing has been made over the past year, most of the “build” needs for the ECLDS remain. Therefore, funding reductions (compared to Phase 1) leverage this progress, but also reflect reductions in scope, guided by Phase 2 state priorities to improve the quality of low-rated early learning and development programs and ensure that high needs children receive high quality care. Consequently, Phase 2 funding will support ways to connect data from the State’s TQRIS, YoungStar, with education and health outcome data, and additional service participation data for the same children at DPI and DHS. This will also require internal bolstering of YoungStar (Wisconsin’s TQRIS), Wisconsin Shares (Wisconsin’s child care subsidy program), and Child Welfare data (as funding permits) at DCF.

The Phase 2 proposal for the ECLDS also reflects a great deal of learning by the ECLDS Project Team and relevant staff at each partnering agency. Over the past year, various staff members have attended ECLDS-related conferences, participated in webinars and conference calls, and worked closely with the federal State Support Team (SST), enabling development of a clearer, more feasible ECLDS implementation plan. The ECLDS Project Team has also convened sub-committees to provide recommendations regarding the identification of current capacity, use of common identifiers, and data governance. In addition, staff members have continued to educate and draw more stakeholders into the planning process, in order to increase the probability of effective implementation and sustainability. The result is a more specific work plan for the project going forward, and more specific requests in this Phase 2 budget.

Changes between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 ECLDS proposals include:

- In the Phase 1 application, most of the funding for the ECLDS was budgeted non-specifically under contracting for “longitudinal data system programming,” with the expectation that these dollars would be distributed as needed as project requirements became better defined. Given the progress and learning that has occurred, Wisconsin can now better indicate how money (for information technology [IT] staff, equipment, training, etc.) should be allocated across departments and phases of the build.
- A number of new state staff positions were also proposed in the Phase 1 application. In the Phase 2 proposal, current staffing needs are better understood and more clearly specified in terms of position and time; however, flexibility to respond to project requirements as they are more clearly defined

(e.g., in terms of which data elements will be added, reporting needs, etc.) remains. The difficulty of recruiting highly skilled IT specialists to state government is reflected in the movement of IT and management positions to contract positions. The need for increased analytic capacity, to effectively utilize the ECLDS, is reflected in the request for a research analyst at *each* of the three partnering agencies (versus a single analyst at DPI).

- The Phase 2 budget request also recognizes the need for a more complex data governance structure than originally proposed in the Phase 1 application (a single advisory board). As reflected in the budgetary staffing and workshop requests, the current Wisconsin ECLDS Project Team will continue to work with the SST, partnering agencies, and other stakeholders to develop and implement this structure.
- Given reduced funding and recognition that the current Master Client Index at DHS is not the best matching indicator available, this application instead proposes to connect three (versus seven) DHS Division of Public Health (DPH) programs via a customer hub, which can then be accessed as a single point connection that indicates the data available within DPH systems and as a record locator function for those authorized to pursue additional data from the individual systems.
- A final change reflected in this application is that Wisconsin no longer plans to pursue selection criteria (E)(1), implementation of a comprehensive kindergarten entry assessment, partly because the State has since passed legislation requiring implementation of a mandatory formative literacy assessment (Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening, or PALS), given upon kindergarten entry and again in the spring of the kindergarten year. This data is being incorporated into DPI's current LDS independent of this grant; therefore, the activity "plan for and incorporate statewide kindergarten readiness assessment data" has been eliminated from this proposal.

Other activities from the FY11 proposal remain in the work plan, and are reflected in the following list of budgetary elements and project Gantt chart (see pp. 80-82, 85, 87-91):

- Overall ECLDS project manager (contracted by DPI, Years 1-4)
- Research Analyst at each agency (1 FTE each at DCF, DPI, DHS), Years 2-4
- Contracted DCF IT team (7.5 people) to be hired via request for proposal [RFP], to build analytic capacity within existing data warehouses (focus on child care/child welfare), merge disparate warehouses into a DCF Enterprise warehouse, and provide/ receive data from other agencies
- Contracted IS project manager (50%, Years 1-4) at DPI to assist with general build and connecting DPI data

- Contracted data governance specialist (50% year 1, 25% years 2-4) at DPI, to lead the establishment and implementation of a sustainable WI ECLDS data governance structure
- Contract staff and operating costs at DHS to build customer hub across 3 Division of Public Health Programs (Vital Records, Immunization Registry, Public Health [e.g., home visiting])
- Selection and build of Entity Resolution Solution (Matching Tool) to match data across agencies
- Data model and presentation layer development (how final product will be presented)
- Training for data users at state and local level (including curriculum development)
- Data governance workshop
- Additional equipment, technical support services, licensing fees, etc. as needed at the three agencies (DCF, DPI, DHS)

E(2) Goal: Develop federated ECLDS that supports data exchanges as well as ad hoc research requests.																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Employ contracted, full-time ECLDS Project Manager to manage ECLDS project for life of grant <i>ECLDS Project Team to design position; DPI to employ</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Employ contracted IT staff (at levels indicated in budget narrative) at each partnering agency to respond to project requirements <i>Current IT management at each partnering agency</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Employ full-time ECLDS Research Analyst at each partnering agency to carry out ECLDS-related research <i>ECLDS Project Team to work with partnering agency management to design position; DCF, DPI, DHS to employ</i>					◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Establish and implement a sustainable WI ECLDS Data Governance Structure, including workshop in Year 1 <i>Data Governance Specialist to lead; Project Team to provide recommendations and work with agency management to establish; ongoing work by Data Governance Committees, in conjunction with Project Manager and Project Team</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Define and establish structures and policies to identify and implement the first crucial Essential Data Elements and linkages. <i>Project Manager, Project Team, program, IT staff, and management at DPI, DCF, DHS</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆												
Define and establish structures and policies to identify and implement Data System Oversight Requirements. <i>Data Governance Specialist; Project Manager, Data Governance Committees</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆												
Select ,build ,test and implement Entity Resolution Solution (Matching Tool) <i>Project Manager, Project Team, IT staff</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆												
Develop MOUs between DPI, DCF, and DHS re: data sharing, data governance, and data quality assurance. <i>Data Governance Specialist to lead; Project Manager, Project Team, Data Governance Committees</i>				◆												
Build and implement DPH Customer Hub <i>DHS</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Implement programming and infrastructure upgrades needed to align data collection standards and create efficient and reliable interoperability between PSA data systems					◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

E(2) Goal: Develop federated ECLDS that supports data exchanges as well as ad hoc research requests.																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
<i>Project Manager, IT Staff</i>																
Add Early Childhood Data to Data Model, WISEdash Development <i>Project Manager, DPI IT Staff</i>					◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Build research agenda, reporting processes and analytical capacity, to answer key policy questions <i>Project Manager, Project Team, Research Analysts, IT & Program Staff</i>					◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Develop training for system users. <i>Training Developer (DPI), in conjunction with existing staff and local experts</i>									◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Provide training for State level system users. <i>Trainers</i>									◆	◆	◆	◆				
Increase access to and usefulness of data at local level, and provide training for system users. <i>Trainers, Data Governance Committees</i>													◆	◆	◆	◆
Address data gaps <i>Project Manager, Project Team, Policy, Program, and IT Staff, Research Analysts</i>					◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

Priority	CPP(2)	Page references from State’s FY11 application	244-256
Please explain why your State has selected to address this priority in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.			

Phase 1 Request: Embedded in B(2)
Phase 2 Request: Embedded in B(2)

Since its Phase 1 submission, Wisconsin has made progress in aligning standards between YoungStar and 4-year-old kindergarten (4K) programs that use community approaches to partner with child care or Head Start. With reduced funding available in Phase 2, Wisconsin has reduced its commitment in Phase 1 regarding including all 4K programs in YoungStar; however, the state remains committed to expanding the number of 4K community based models and encouraging them to participate in YoungStar. Efforts since 2011 include the development of resource materials on the YoungStar website with the aim of increasing participation. With more limited resources, Wisconsin proposes to work with the existing 4K Task Force, with a goal of increasing the overall number of collaborative 4K programs in Wisconsin, and continue efforts to encourage collaborative 4K programs to participate in YoungStar. In conjunction with section C(1), C(4), and D(1), activities will focus on cross-sector, collaborative professional development related to program evaluation, curriculum and assessment practices. (See pp. 86, 89)

Goal CPP2-1: Increase the number of early learning and development programs in YoungStar																
<i>Application Crosswalk: (B)(3)(b) and B4</i>																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Increase participation of all ELD to 90% of regulated programs. <i>Responsible Party: DCF & Young Star consortium</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Increase Head Start and Early Head Start participation to 100% by 2015	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Increase rate of collaborative 4k programs participating in YoungStar	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆

Priority	IP(5)	Page references from State's FY11 application	259-261
<p>Please explain why your State has selected to address this priority in its Phase 2 RTT-ELC application, and what modifications, if any, will be needed in light of the 50% funding level. Please refer to the relevant pages in the budget narrative submitted with this application.</p>			

Phase 1 Request: \$300,000

Phase 2 Request: Embedded in A(3)

Progress Wisconsin has made since its Phase 1 application includes the development of a grant program to support local partnerships focused on early childhood system building efforts. The funding source for these community grants is American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds that support the ECAC. This process has been approved by and will be overseen by the ECAC to ensure that activities supports are in alignment with the ECAC priorities and with RTTT-ELC goals. The initial community partnership grants were awarded in late 2012.

In addition, Governor Walker also created a Read to Lead Board which has a focus on early literacy and was modeled after the proposal developed by the Public /Private Project Team (which is attached to the Partnership for Wisconsin's Economic Success). Described in the Phase 1 application, this proposal was reviewed and recommended by the ECAC in late 2011. The Read to Lead Board is still under development. The ECAC's Public/Private Partnership Project Team has established a vision of providing support to communities in all areas of comprehensive early childhood system development, not just early literacy.

In light of these accomplishments, Wisconsin remains committed to establishing an early childhood public-private funding board as a critical infrastructure that will remain beyond the life of the grant and serve as a mechanism to sustain key early education efforts in the future and the amount requested remains the same as in Phase 1.

Funds will support DCF efforts to work with the ECAC and the Read to Lead Board to determine the best way of ensuring that a comprehensive public-private board is developed to support all aspects of early care and education. It is anticipated that a competitive bid process would be issued in year 3 and implementation of the board would also begin that year. By year four, the public/ private board would begin raising private resources to be used as match to the public dollars provided.

(See pp. 86, 89)

Amended goals to reflect progress since Phase 1 include the following.

CPP5-1 Develop a public private partnership board to support comprehensive early care and education investment opportunities.																
Key Activities	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Coordinate with Read to Lead Board in the formation of broader board <i>DCF, ECAC</i>	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Monitor the results of the existing early childhood community partnerships	◆	◆	◆													
Explore the feasibility of issuing a small RFP to support new/ emerging early childhood collaboratives.			◆													
Use findings from grant programs to shape initial plan for a more comprehensive early childhood public-private entity				◆												
Issue RFP for administration of a new Board					◆	◆										
Start up activities and fundraising for new board							◆	◆								
New comprehensive board in place by year 3									◆							
Grants made available to local entities in Year 3											◆					

PART 4: Tables and Performance Measures

Tables A(1) -1 through 3 have been updated with current data. Tables 4 and 5 have been updated with FY 2012 figures. Tables 6 through 9 and 13 have not been updated; Tables 10-12 have been updated. See narrative for references to 2011 Tables.

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income³ families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	No updated information available*	No updated information available
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	No updated information available	No updated information available
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	No updated information available	No updated information available
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	181,915	44.2%
<p><i>Data Source:</i> Note that WI presents a new, improved data source for this table, compared to the FY 2011 application: Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) calculations of American Community Survey data, Table B17024, http://www.census.gov/acs/, 2011, number of low-income children under age 6 . These updated numbers are also used in Table (A)(1)-2; therefore, numbers in that table are not directly comparable to those in FY 2011.</p> <p>*Only aggregated updated numbers are available; however, as they are based on recent census data, the State has no expectation that the proportions by age have changed significantly since the FY 2011 application.</p>		

Please see page 34 of FY 2011 Application for comparison.

³ Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.

Table (A)(1)-2: Special populations of Children with High Needs		
<i>The State should use these data to guide its thinking about where specific activities may be required to address special populations' unique needs. The State will describe such activities throughout its application.</i>		
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...
<i>Administrative Data (eWiSACWIS), Placement Activity Report-SM10A110,(2011).</i>		
Are refugees* Data Source: <i>Department of State Reports on Arrivals for the year 2011</i>	89	0.02%
<p><i>*Are English Learners: The state was unable to find specific data for this category, but the counts and percentages were estimated using percent subgroups enrolled in public schools (2011-2012) and children under age five census data (2010) (U.S. Census Data: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55000.html)</i></p> <p><i>*Have disabilities or developmental delays: The number in the FY 11 application accidentally double-counted 3- year-olds under Part B; this update correctly includes only 4- and 5-year-olds.</i></p> <p><i>*Reside on Indian Lands: Race of children under age 5, American Indian and Alaskan Native.</i></p> <p><i>* Are migrant: The state was unable to find specific data for this category, but the counts and percentages were estimated using percent subgroups enrolled in public schools (2010-2011) and children under age five census data (2010) (U.S. Census Data: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55000.html). No updated information was available.</i></p> <p><i>*Are homeless: Data reported are for children ages six and under. No updated information was available.</i></p> <p><i>*Are in foster care: Data reported are for children ages five and under.</i></p> <p><i>*Are refugees: Wisconsin does not collect information on secondary migrant children separately from other migrant children. In addition, the children who may have been born to refugee parents during this time, but born in Wisconsin, are U.S. citizens, and therefore not included in this count.</i></p>		

Please see pages 34-36 of FY 2011 Application for comparison.

Table (A)(1)-3: 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.

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age			
	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool* <i>Data Source and Year: 2011-2012 ISES enrollment data</i>	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	43,796	43,796
Early Head Start and Head Start⁸ <i>Data Source and Year: 2011 Head Start Program Information Report (PIR). Wisconsin Office of Head Start</i>	884	1,346	16,339	18,569
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 <i>Data Source and Year: Part B: 2011-2012 ISES/SLDS data Part C: 2011 Federal Child Count Submission</i>	B - Not Applicable C - 713	B – Not Applicable C - 5,298	B - 16,106 C – Not Applicable	B - 16,106 C – 6,011
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA <i>Data Source and Year: Wisconsin 2011-12 End of Year Title IA report; ISES/SLDS data</i>	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	18,325	18,325
Programs receiving funds from the State’s CCDF program <i>Data Source and Year: Child Care Child Universe in WebI (Wisconsin State Administrative Data). Data based on the child’s age (under age 6) as of 12/31/11</i>	4,046	19,570	33,052	56,668
Home Visiting * <i>Data Source and Year: Wisconsin Public Health Information Network, 2011 https://phin.wisconsin.gov/sphere/</i>	721	648	290	1,659
Medicaid Therapy Services* <i>Data Source and Year: MMIS MA for COS Therapy for recipient, ages 0, 1,2,3,4. (2010)</i>	953	5,590	672	7,215

⁸ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Table (A)(1)-3: 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.

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age			
	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
Children’s LTS Waivers*				
Non-Autism	Non - 2	Non - 9	Non – 76	Non – 87
Autism	Autism - 0	Autism - 0	Autism - 137	Autism - 137
<i>Data Source and Year: 2011-12 data is from CLTS database.</i>				

**State Funded Preschool: In Wisconsin, when a district offers 4K, it must be open for all age eligible children in the district; therefore, these numbers represent all children enrolled, not just those with high needs. The state does not track income data for 4K participants; however, the program reaches many low-income children, since the program is free. For example, approximately 34% of children attending Wisconsin 4K attend programs collaborating with Head Start and meet that program’s income eligibility requirements (NIEER, 2011). Furthermore, approximately 22% of children in Wisconsin 4K received special education services in 2011 (NIEER, 2011).*

**Early Head Start and Head Start: Based on 2011-2012 Head Start Program Information Report: “Total Cumulative Enrollment” and “Children by Age.” Does not adjust for turn-over or dropout rates. See Table (A) (1)-5 for Total Funded Enrollment.*

**Programs funded under Title 1 of ESEA: Districts are required to report their participation in Title 1, but they are not required to report number of participants under age five. Some districts voluntarily collect this data (total represented here); however, this number likely represents underreporting of actual participation.*

**Programs receiving funds from the State’s CCDF program: All Wisconsin Shares recipients are considered high needs, with eligibility starting at 185% FPL and continuing until income reaches 200% FPL.*

**Home Visiting: These counts include participants with data entered in the state’s Public Health data base, Secure Public Health Electronic Record Environment (SPHERE). All state- and MIECHV funded programs are now required to enter data in SPHERE; however this is a very recent requirement. Therefore, totals in this table likely represent underreporting of actual participation in home visiting across the state.*

**Medicaid Therapy Services: Includes the following sub categories of service to children ages birth to over the age of 2; (outpatient and inpatient) occupational therapy, outpatient physical therapy, outpatient speech therapy, physical therapy, rehabilitative occupational, physical and speech therapies, restorative care occupational, physical and speech therapies. This also applies to School Based Services where children ages 0 to over 2 can receive speech therapy. Because of claims lag, SFY 12 recipients may be over or under estimated. Numbers by age estimated using January 2012 percent of recipients by age applied to total SFY 12 recipients.*

**Children’s LTS Waivers: Includes those with autism and other long-term disabilities; these kids are not covered by Medicaid. The waiver services are paid for by Medicaid, but there are different eligibility criteria for this population which enable them to be covered, without the waiver they would not get these services. These numbers reflect children less than age 5 as of 9/1/11.*

See pages 36-39 of FY 2011 application for comparison.

Table (A)(1)-4: Historical data on funding for Early Learning and Development						
Type of investment	Funding for each of the Past 6 Fiscal Years					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start⁹ <i>Data Source: Wisconsin State Statute (WSS) Chapter 20 appropriation schedule</i>	\$7,212,500	\$7,212,500	\$7,212,500	\$6,960,100	\$6,960,100	\$5,775,000
State-funded preschool * State School Aid Appropriation 4K start up grants <i>Data Source: 4K start up grants; WSS Chapter 20 appropriation schedule; State-funded preschool; DPI school finance formula</i>	\$74,000,000 Not Applicable	\$86,000,000 Not Applicable	\$105,000,000 \$3,000,000	\$122,000,000 \$3,000,000	\$140,000,000 \$1,500,000	\$147,000,000 \$1,350,000
State contributions to IDEA Part C (GPR then Local)* <i>Data Source: Birth-to-3 from county contract reconciliation</i>	\$6,973,969 \$13,994,374 Total: \$20,968,343	\$6,544,228 \$15,172,005 Total: \$21,716,233	\$6,704,087 \$12,384,097 Total: \$19,088,184	\$6,898,278 \$14,753,945 Total: \$21,652,223	\$5,558,410 \$14,076,105 Total: \$19,634,515	\$6,973,969 \$13,994,374 Total: \$20,968,343
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry* <i>Data Source: PI-1505 Special Education Annual Report</i>	\$14,199,800	\$14,740,500	\$14,675,300	\$14,631,400	\$14,833,400	\$14,914,061

⁹ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Table (A)(1)-4: Historical data on funding for Early Learning and Development						
Type of investment	Funding for each of the Past 6 Fiscal Years					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total State contributions to CCDF^{10*} <i>Data Source: WisMart general ledger expenditures</i>	\$131,276,536	\$137,926,194	\$92,575,228	\$87,582,655	\$52,177,481	\$28,849,400
State match to CCDF* <i>Exceeded/Met/Not Met (if exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded)</i> <i>Data Source: WisMart general ledger expenditures</i>	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs^{11*} <i>Data Source: WisMart general ledger expenditures</i>	\$154,928,467	\$136,533,442	\$216,669,054	\$155,436,320	\$181,887,833	\$217,030,087
School Based Services* (GPR and Local Match) <i>Data Source: SBS data from the MMIS Medicaid Claims</i>	\$3,881,677	\$3,885,935	\$3,554,852	\$2,902,633	\$3,434,867	\$3,881,300
MA Therapies* <i>Data Source: MMIS Medicaid Claims</i>	\$8,007,079	\$8,090,834	\$9,179,848	\$10,014,117	\$9,442,321	\$9,778,200

¹⁰ Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.

¹¹ Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

Table (A)(1)-4: Historical data on funding for Early Learning and Development

Type of investment	Funding for each of the Past 6 Fiscal Years					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
CLTS Waivers* <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> Non-Autism (GPR and Local) </div> <div style="width: 45%; text-align: right;"> \$40,822 </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> Autism (State) </div> <div style="width: 45%; text-align: right;"> \$2,776,212 </div> </div> <i>Data Source: HSRS and TPA claims data</i>	\$40,822	\$80,034	\$74,158	\$89,438	\$188,210	\$465,000
	\$2,776,212	\$1,777,559	\$1,323,371	\$1,811,684	\$1,675,242	\$1,520,030
Home Visiting* (GPR) <i>Data Source: Wismart general ledger expenditures</i>	\$693,747	\$1,027,437	\$1,019,089	\$1,503,930	\$711,631	\$781,158
Total State contributions:	\$417,985,183	\$418,990,668	\$473,371,583	\$427,584,500	\$432,445,601	\$452,312,579

**Note: Wisconsin’s State Fiscal Year (SFY) runs from July 1 through June 30.*

**State Funded Preschool: The top figures represent the state share of funding for public 4K programs; funding is provided through the state’s general school aid formula. The bottom figures are for the state’s 4K Startup Grants.*

**IDEA Part C, GPR then Local: GPR=General Purpose Revenue; i.e., state tax revenue; Local=revenue from local governments, non-profits and private donations. Actual local contributions for IDEA Part C, 2011, are not yet available. To enable totaling for 2011, a previous four-year average was used as a proxy.*

**State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry: Early childhood related expenditures reported for state SPED categorical aid.*

**Total State Contributions to CCDF: The TANF Contingency fund MOE requirements meant that Wisconsin used more TANF for CC because state funds spent on CC could not be used to draw the TANF contingency funds. The TANF used for CC went up in these years where the state funds went down. Includes child care subsidies for ages 0 – 13. Wisconsin uses a small portion of pre-kindergarten (PK) state expenditures as CCDF match. The amounts are included in the “State-funded preschool” row. By year, the PK state expenditures used as CCDF match are: \$4.3M in 2007; \$4.3M in 2008; \$0.0 in 2009; \$4.0M in 2010; \$3.8M in 2011; and \$3.2M in 2012.*

**State match to CCDF: Wisconsin does not report excess match but does spend additional state funds that are eligible to use as match if needed. The amount of additional eligible match is included in the “Total State contributions to CCDF” row. By year, the state funds eligible to count as match but not used as match are: \$11.7M in 2007; \$30.2M in 2008; \$8.7M in 2009; \$13.0M in 2010; and \$13.5M in 2011; and \$12.4M in 2012.*

**TANF Spending on Early Learning and Development Programs: The total includes child care subsidies for ages 0 – 13. Total expenditures for child care subsidies have declined since FY08, and Wisconsin used relatively more TANF and less state funding because state expenditures for child care were ineligible for coverage by Wisconsin’s TANF Contingency award.*

Table (A)(1)-4: Historical data on funding for Early Learning and Development						
Type of investment	Funding for each of the Past 6 Fiscal Years					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<p><i>*School Based Services, MA Therapies and CLTS Waivers: Because of claims lag, SFY 11 claims data for SBS, MA Therapies, and CLTS are based on July-Dec 2010 data doubled. Also because of claims lag, actual SFY 12 claims are not final and these numbers could increase or decrease. MA Therapies estimates include all funds. GPR amount for SFY12=\$3,056,100.</i></p> <p><i>*Home Visiting: Due to the alignment of state funding with federal MIECHV funding in 2011, not all designated GPR funds were distributed, resulting in a slight increase in GPR in 2012. Due to MIECHV funding, overall spending on home visiting increased significantly in SFY 12, including an additional \$3,124,700 federal funds from the state's competitive development grant.</i></p>						

See pages 40-43 of FY 2011 application for comparison.

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program for each of the past 6 years ¹²					
	2007	2008	2009 ¹³	2010	2011	2012
State-funded preschool * <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i> 2007 = 2007-08 school year, etc. <i>Data Source: 2011-2012 ISES enrollment data.</i>	27,759	33,976	38,071	41,192	46,022	Not Available
Early Head Start and Head Start¹⁴ <i>(funded enrollment)</i> <i>Data Source: Center for Law and Social Policy, Analysis of Head Start PIR data, August 2011 (years 2007-2010); Wisconsin Office of Head Start PIR Report (2011).</i>	18,889	18,526	18,555	19,276	21,349	19,302
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 <i>(annual December 1 count)</i> Part B: Part C: <i>Data Sources: 2011-2012 ISES/SLDS data (Part B); federal count reports (Part C).</i>	(B) 14,867 (C) 5,597	(B) 15,153 (C) 5,980	(B) 15,657 (C) 6,000	(B) 16,079 (C) 6,131	(B) 16,106 (C) 6,011	Not Available Not Available
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA* <i>Data Source: Wisconsin 2011-12 End of Year Title IA report</i>	10,750	11,769	12,179	13,366	14,597	18, 325
Programs receiving CCDF funds* <i>(average monthly served)</i> <i>Data Source: Child Care Attendance Data (db2 data) 2011</i>	55,432	56,848	56,114	55,597	47,873	46,686

¹² Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.

¹³ Note to Reviewers: The number of children served reflects a mix of Federal, State, and local spending. Head Start, IDEA, and CCDF all received additional Federal funding under the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which may be reflected in increased numbers of children served in 2009-2011.

¹⁴ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program for each of the past 6 years ¹²					
	2007	2008	2009 ¹³	2010	2011	2012
Home Visiting* <i>Data Source: Wisconsin Public Health Information Network/SPHERE. Accessed on 10/15/2012..</i> https://phin.wisconsin.gov/sphere/	918	922	1,187	1,443	1,100	1,421
School Based Services* <i>Data Source: MMIS Medicaid Claims.</i>	5,204	5,311	4,814	5,264	5,701	6,130
MA Therapies* <i>Data Source: MMIS Medicaid Claims.</i>	5,550	5,932	6,432	6,605	6,603	7,214
CLTS Waivers* <div style="text-align: right;"> Autism Non-Autism </div>	48 401	84 261	103 315	125 334	Not Available	Not Available

***State Funded Preschool:** In Wisconsin, when a district offers 4K, it must be open for all age eligible children in the district; therefore, these numbers represent all children enrolled, not just those with high needs. The state does not track income data for 4K participants; however, the program reaches many low-income children, since the program is free. For example, approximately 34% of children attending Wisconsin 4K attend programs collaborating with Head Start and meet that program's income eligibility requirements (NIEER, 2011). Furthermore, approximately 22% of children in Wisconsin 4K received special education services in 2011 (NIEER, 2011).

Early Head Start and Head Start: This count is based on the number of slots budgeted, not actual enrollment. All participants are low income.

***Programs funded under Title 1 of ESEA:** Districts are required to report their participation in Title 1, but they are not required to report number of participants under age five. Some districts voluntarily collect this data (total represented here); however, this number likely represents underreporting of actual participation.

***Programs receiving CCDF funds:** 2011 data based on attendance begin date. These numbers do not match numbers in the final column of Table A-1-3, because this section is asking for "average monthly served"; A-1-3 asks for total served in the entire year.

***Home Visiting:** These counts include participants with data entered in the state's Public Health data base, (SPHERE). All state- and MIECHV funded programs are now required to enter data in SPHERE; however this is a very recent requirement. Therefore, totals in this table likely represent underreporting of actual participation in home visiting across the state. Numbers for 2011 include data through 9-14-11; due to MIECHV funding, including receipt of a competitive grant, Wisconsin will likely enroll more than 500 additional children in the coming year.

***School Based Services, MA Therapies and CLTS Waivers:** Because of claims lag, SFY 12 recipients may be over or under estimated. Unduplicated Therapy count (all therapy services), but not unduplicated between Therapies and SBS.

See pages 43-46 of FY 2011 application for comparison.

Note: There have been no significant changes since the Phase 1 application for

- Table (A)(1)-6. Please see page 46 of FY 2011 application.
- Table (A)(1)-7. Please see pages 47-50 of FY 2011 application.
- Table (A)(1)-8, although the presence of health literacy activities in Head Start and Early Head Start should have been noted. Please see pages 50-53 of FY 2011 application.
- Table (A)(1)-9. Please see pages 53-57 of FY 2011 application.

Table (A)(1)-10: Status of all early learning and development workforce credentials¹⁵ currently available in the State				
List the early learning and development workforce credentials in the State	If State has a workforce knowledge and competency framework, is the credential aligned to it? (Yes/No/Not Available)	Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have the credential		Notes (if needed)
		#	%	
Wisconsin Registry Credentials*				
<i>Data Source: Wisconsin's Registry http://www.the-registry.org/; data pull 10/1/2012</i>				
Administrators	Yes			Denominator is 1,542. It is derived from the total number of Center Directors (50 or fewer), Center Directors (51 or more) and Administrators over all career levels in the Registry.
*Level 9 Credential		26	1.7%	
*Level 10 Credential		122	7.9%	
*Level 11 Credential		142	9.2%	
Associates Degree		385	25.0%	
Bachelors Degree		448	29.1%	
Masters Degree		92	6.0%	
Doctorate Degree		5	0.3%	
*CDA		22	1.4%	
Staff- <i>Center Based</i>	Yes			Denominator is 8,879. It is derived from the total number of Teachers and Assistant Teachers over all Career Levels in the Registry.
*Level 9 Credential		310	3.5%	
*Level 10 Credential		213	2.4%	
*Level 11 Credential		646	7.3%	
Associates Degree		1,809	20.4%	
Bachelors Degree		1,291	14.5%	
Masters Degree		97	1.1%	
Doctorate Degree		1	<	
*CDA		268	.01%	
Staff- <i>Home Based</i>	Yes			Denominator is 1,033. It is derived from the total number of Licensed Family Child Care and Certified Family Child Care over all Career
*Level 9 Credential		51	4.9%	
*Level 10 Credential		31	3.0%	
*Level 11 Credential		87	8.4%	

¹⁵ Includes both credentials awarded and degrees attained.

Table (A)(1)-10: Status of all early learning and development workforce credentials¹⁵ currently available in the State

List the early learning and development workforce credentials in the State	If State has a workforce knowledge and competency framework, is the credential aligned to it? (Yes/No/Not Available)	Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have the credential		Notes (if needed)
		#	%	
Associates Degree		208	20.1%	Levels in the Registry.
Bachelors Degree		68	6.6%	
Masters Degree		15	1.5%	
Doctorate Degree		0	0.0%	
*CDA		11	1.1%	
<p>Wisconsin PK-12 Educator Licensing* <i>All Wisconsin educators teaching in public schools (PK-12, including four-year-old kindergarten) must have BA/BS with a valid Wisconsin Teaching License. All current licenses are issued under Wis. Admin. Rule PI-34.27.</i> Data Source: Data pull from Wisconsin's Educator Licensure database, 10/16/12.</p>				
Early Childhood Regular Education (#70-777) (ages birth to age 8)	YES – Wisconsin and National program standards	(A) 2,462 (B) 1,311	100%	This license went into effect after August 31, 2004.
Special Education (#70-809) (ages birth to age 8)	YES – Wisconsin and National program standard	(A) 1,186 (B) 724	100%	This license went into effect after August 31, 2004.
Early Childhood -Middle Childhood (#71-777) (ages birth to age 11)	YES – Wisconsin and National program standards	(A) 4,654 (B) 2,346	100%	This license went into effect after August 31, 2004.
PK; PK-K; PK-3; PK-6; and K-6 licenses issues under PI-3	YES – Wisconsin statutory language license requirements	(A) 12,545 (B) 7,260	100%	These licenses were issued prior to August 31, 2004 and are no longer available. Educators are employed in the state with these licenses.

Please see pages 58-61 of FY 2011 Application for comparison.

Table (A)(1)-11: Summary of current postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in the State that issue credentials or degrees to Early Childhood Educators

List postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in the State that issue credentials or degrees to Early Childhood Educators	Number of Early Childhood Educators that received an early learning credential or degree from this entity in the previous year	Does the entity align its programs with the State's current Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials? (Yes/No/Not Available)
<p>Early Childhood credentials and degrees remain available at all of the University of Wisconsin System and Wisconsin Technical College Campus Locations listed in the FY 2011 application. Other professional development providers listed also still apply.</p>	<p>235 Credentials were awarded in 2011 in Wisconsin. Updated numbers of degrees by entity for 2011 are not yet available.</p> <p>The T.E.A.C.H.® Scholarship Program* is currently supporting 1,273 active scholarship recipients working towards credits, credentials and degrees.</p>	<p>*Yes (remains the answer for all entities)</p>
<p><i>*T.E.A.C.H.® Scholarship: The Teacher Education and Compensation Helps (T.E.A.C.H.®) is an initiative in Wisconsin that links training, compensation and commitment to improving the quality of early childhood care and education experiences for young children and their families. The program administers a scholarship and bonus program for child care workers. The Wisconsin State Registry awards credentials to those participants who finish the set criteria. Data Source: Wisconsin T.E.A.C.H.®. Early Childhood Scholarship Activity Program. Wisconsin Early Childhood Association (WECA)</i></p> <p><i>*Program Alignment: Course work in all credentials is credit based, and coursework is available throughout the Wisconsin Technical College System, and aligned with the Registry Core Knowledge areas. Wisconsin Core Competencies have been aligned with DPI 10 Teacher Standards, the Wisconsin Technical College System Early Childhood Program Outcome http://www.collaboratingpartners.com/docs/coreComp0708.pdf</i></p>		

Please see pages 61-65 of FY 2011 Application for comparison.

Table (A)(1)-12: Current status of the State’s Kindergarten Entry Assessment

State’s Kindergarten Entry Assessment	Essential Domains of School Readiness				
	Language and literacy	Cognition and general knowledge (including early mathematics and early scientific development)	Approaches toward learning	Physical well-being and motor development	Social and emotional development
<p><i>Note:</i> 11 Wisconsin Act 166 (2011), charged the WI DPI with selecting a literacy assessment to be administered to all kindergarten students beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. A cross-divisional literacy team composed of members from the DPI analyzed a number of tests to determine which assessment would best meet statutory requirements, reflect values of the Governor’s Read-to-Lead Task Force, and provide guidance to classroom teachers. Wisconsin State Superintendent, Dr. Tony Evers, approved the selection of the Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS) developed by the University of Virginia, as the kindergarten screener. It is in its first year of implementation and will be given to all WI kindergarten students in the fall and spring. This change is reflected in the table below. Currently, Wisconsin does not implement a Statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment in the other domains, although many individual school districts continue to assess children upon kindergarten entry and use the information to improve instruction. Other than the PALS, decisions regarding whether to assess children and what assessment(s) to use are locally determined. Given reduced funding and the current implementation of PALS, WI has chosen not to pursue Selection Criterion (E)(1) in Phase 2.</p>					
Domain covered? (Y/N)	Y	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Domain aligned to Early Learning and Development Standards? (Y/N)	Y	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Instrument(s) used? (Specify)	Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Evidence of validity and reliability? (Y/N)	Y	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Evidence of validity for English learners? (Y/N)	Y	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Evidence of validity for children with disabilities? (Y/N)	Y	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
How broadly administered? (If not administered statewide, include date for reaching statewide administration)	statewide				
Results included in Statewide Longitudinal Data System? Y/N)	in progress				

Please see page 66 of FY 2011 Application for comparison.

Note: There have been no significant changes since the Phase 1 application for Table (A)(1)-13. Please see pages 67-69 of FY 2011 application.

The required performance measures for Core Area B are updated below and referenced in Section B.

Performance Measures for (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System											
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Number of programs in the State	<i>Baseline and Annual Targets -- Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System</i>									
		Baseline (Today)		Target- end of calendar year 2013		Target -end of calendar year 2014		Target- end of calendar year 2015		Target- end of calendar year 2016	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool*	393 of 414 elementary school districts offer 4K; 110 are community-based	5	1%	21	5%	42	10%	63	16%	100	25%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹⁶	136	37	27%	54	40%	88	65%	108	80%	136	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C**	Not applicable										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619***	Not applicable										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA****	Not applicable										
Programs receiving funds from CCDF *****	3,858	3,858	100%	4,000	100%	4,200	100%	4,500	100%	5000	100%
Other All regulated programs*****	6,361	4,897	77%	5,000	79%	5,100	80%	5,150	81%	5,200	82%
<i>*Wisconsin proposes to focus on collaborative school districts and align curricula with public school districts as described in the narrative.</i>											

¹⁶ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measures for (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System											
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Number of programs in the State	<i>Baseline and Annual Targets -- Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System</i>									
		Baseline (Today)		Target- end of calendar year 2013		Target -end of calendar year 2014		Target- end of calendar year 2015		Target- end of calendar year 2016	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<p><i>**Birth to 3 programs are governed by federal IDEA. Generally, services are provided in a child's home.</i></p> <p><i>***Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) services are governed by federal IDEA law and receive services in the least restrictive environment. Children who have been identified may also be participating in public school or collaborative preschool programs and will benefit from the standards alignment and services already provided.</i></p> <p><i>****Title I services support a variety of services for low-income families and young children. As noted for ECSE, these children are often enrolled in public school or collaborative community-based pre-k programs and benefit from the alignment and services already provided.</i></p> <p><i>*****Providers that accept CCDF funding through the Wisconsin Shares child care subsidy program are required to participate in YoungStar.</i></p> <p><i>*****Includes licensed group and family, provisionally certified family, & regularly certified family providers.</i></p>											

Performance Measure for (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS).					
	Baseline (Today)	Target- end of calendar year 2013	Target- end of calendar year 2014	Target- end of calendar year 2015	Target- end of calendar year 2016
Total, programs covered by the TQRIS	4,897	5,000	5,100	5,150	5,200
# of 1 Star programs	36	36	34	32	30
# of 2 Star programs	2,980	3,400	3,000	2,662	2,200
# of 3 Star programs	852	1,069	1,426	1,581	2,000
# of 4 Star programs	128	165	240	386	420
# of 5 Star programs	269	330	400	489	550
<p><i>Wisconsin's TQRIS rates providers using a 40-point star rating scale between 1 and 5 stars with 5 being the highest. The TQRIS is a hybrid model with building blocks and points whereby providers need to achieve specific milestones and earn a certain quantity of points to attain each star level. The baseline data shown are actual and are collected using the automated system that was built to manage the rating and casework for the program.</i></p>					

Performance Measures for (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 Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Number of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	Baseline and Annual Targets -- Number and percent of Children with High Needs Participating in Programs that are in the top tiers of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System									
		Baseline (Today)		Target- end of calendar year 2013		Target -end of calendar year 2014		Target- end of calendar year 2015		Target- end of calendar year 2016	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool*	Not available										
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹⁷	16,500	2,432	15%	5,775	35%	8,250	50%	12,375	75%	16,500	100%
ELD Programs funded by IDEA, Part C**	Not applicable										
ELD Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, Section 619***	Not applicable										
ELD Programs funded under Title I of ESEA****	Not applicable										
ELD Programs receiving CCDF funds	40,662*****	6,219	15%	6,913	17%	8,132	20%	9,759	24%	10,572	26%
Other: All regulated programs*****	55,000	8,325	15%	9,435	17%	11,100	20%	13,332	24%	14,430	26%

The top tiers of Wisconsin's TQRIS are 4 Star and 5 Star providers.

**Wisconsin proposes to focus on collaborative school districts and align curricula with public school districts as described in the narrative.*

***Birth to 3 programs are governed by federal IDEA. Generally, services are provided in a child's home.*

****Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) services are governed by federal IDEA law and receive services in the least restrictive environment. Identified children also may be participating in public school or collaborative preschool programs and as such will benefit from the standards alignment and services already provided.*

*****Title I supports a variety of services for low-income families and young children. As noted for ECSE, these children often are enrolled in public school or collaborative community-based pre-k programs and benefit from the alignment and services already provided.*

******This shows the actual number of children in the Wisconsin Shares program with an open authorized at the time of the data run.*

******This includes children served licensed group, licensed family, provisionally certified family and regularly certified family providers. This is an estimate as Wisconsin does not track private pay children in regulated care.*

¹⁷ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

There may be selection criteria in a State's FY 2011 application that the State does not address in its Phase 2 application. For criteria addressed in a State's Phase 2 application, the State must complete the performance measure tables or provide an attachment with the required performance measure information. The State may provide additional performance measures, baseline data, and targets for a criterion if it chooses. If a State does not have baseline data for a performance measure, the State should indicate that the data are not available and explain why.

In Phase 2, Wisconsin is not addressing selection criterion D(2) and the related performance tables are not included in this application.

PART 5: BUDGET

BUDGET PART I: SUMMARY

BUDGET PART I – TABLES

OVERALL STATEWIDE BUDGET					
Budget Table I-1: Budget Summary by Budget Category (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(4)(b))					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	373,426	560,626	560,626	560,626	2,055,304
2. Fringe Benefits	164,074	244,832	244,832	244,832	898,570
3. Travel	29,788	30,634	30,634	30,634	121,690
4. Equipment	316,700	60,000	64,000	85,600	526,300
5. Supplies	163,950	226,850	227,354	223,350	841,504
6. Contractual	3,541,819	2,945,477	2,513,297	2,109,797	11,110,390
7. Training Stipends	0	0	0	0	0
8. Other	81,264	79,500	104,000	113,200	377,964
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	4,671,021	4,147,919	3,744,743	3,368,039	15,931,722
10. Indirect Costs*	11,509	18,809	19,151	18,809	68,278
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	1,500,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	6,300,000
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	400,000
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	6,282,530	5,866,728	5,463,894	5,086,848	22,700,000
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	1,870,987	1,803,733	1,071,233	1,071,233	5,817,188
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	8,153,517	7,670,461	6,535,127	6,158,081	28,517,187

OVERALL STATEWIDE BUDGET					
Budget Table I-2: Budget Summary by Participating State Agency					
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(4)(b))					
Agency Name	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
DCF	5,031,444	5,325,782	4,719,782	4,316,282	19,393,290
DPI	2,286,073	2,068,742	1,539,408	1,565,862	7,460,086
DHS	836,000	275,937	275,937	275,937	1,663,811
Total Statewide Budget	8,153,517	7,670,461	6,535,127	6,158,081	28,517,187

OVERALL STATEWIDE BUDGET**Budget Table I-3: Budget Summary by Project**

(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(4)(b))

Project	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
A-St Systems	493,142	473,258	473,258	473,258	1,912,918
B1- TQRIS	553,712	543,830	543,830	543,830	2,185,200
B2- Inclusion	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	180,000
B3- Rating	0	0	0	0	0
B4-Hi Need	2,174,188	2,119,438	2,150,938	1,919,438	8,364,000
B5- Validation	438,200	457,500	0	0	895,700
C1- WMELS	514,893	532,955	546,297	539,955	2,134,100
C4-Family Engagement	220,750	330,750	330,750	330,750	1,213,000
D1-Crdent'ls	286,566	246,899	246,403	244,399	1,024,267
D2-Ed Support	600,000	600,000	0	0	1,200,000
E1-K Assess	0	0	0	0	0
E2-Data Syst	2,827,066	2,320,832	2,198,652	2,061,452	9,408,002
Inv Priority 5	0	0	0	0	0
Total Statewide Budget	8,153,517	7,670,461	6,535,127	6,158,081	28,517,187

BUDGET PART I -NARRATIVE

DCF

As the Lead Agency, DCF will organize its operations to manage the RTTT ELC funds and accomplish the work set forth in the MOU and scope of work by hiring a Grant Manager in the Division of Early Care and Education. The Grant manager's primary responsibility is to ensure the implementation of WI's RTTT ELC reform agenda. Specific responsibilities include grant leadership across the participating state agencies (PSAs) to ensure the scope of work as outlined in the MOU is effectively implemented and acting as the RTTT-ELC grant liaison to the Early Childhood Advisory Council and other external stakeholders. The grant manager ensures funds are transferred to the Participating State Agencies in a timely manner consistent with state procurement policy and works directly with key managers at the Participating State Agencies to ensure activities within their scope of authority and responsibility are carried out. DCF will make administrative support services (budget, finance, procurement, human resources, facilities, etc.) available to the grant manager as needed to fulfill the scope of work. As the YoungStar administrator, DCF's Division of Early Care and Education will oversee the program improvements and target population expansions as described in Sections B(1) – B(5), C(4) and CPP (2). DCF will provide leadership in the development of a public-private partnership as referenced in A(3) and described in IP (5). In coordination with DPI, DCF will contract for an IT team and will employ a research analyst to carry out activities described in Section E(2).

DPI

The DPI Division for Academic Excellence Assistant Superintendent will serve as the DPI lead contact for the RTTT ELC funds and scope of work as set forth in the MOU. She will work within DPI to ensure the scope of work is accomplished as set forth in this application, providing oversight to the Office of Early Learning (carrying out the activities described in Sections C1, D1 and CPP2), and coordinating with the Assistant Superintendent for the Division for Libraries, Technology and Community Learning, who will oversee the work of the EC LDS overall project manager and research analyst employed to carry out the activities of the grant period as described in Section E(2).

DHS

The DHS Division of Public Health Administrator will serve as the DHS lead contact for the RTTT ELC funds and Scope of Work, and will ensure DHS's scope of work is accomplished as set forth in this application, including the build and development of a DPH customer hub and the work of a

Research Analyst, in coordination with the overall EC LDS project manager located in DPI as described in Section E(2).

2. Participating State Agency's roles and responsibilities.

Table 1 describes each participating state agency's high level roles and responsibilities by selection criterion of the application. Taken together, these projects comprise Wisconsin's Phase 2 reform agenda/State Plan.

Table 1. PSA Roles & Responsibilities

Selection Criterion	Participating Party	Roles & Responsibilities/Type of Participation
(A)(1)	N/A	
(A)(2)	N/A	
(A)(3)	DCF DPI	As the lead agency, DCF will have overall authority to carry out and enforce the terms specified in the MOU; employ an RTTT ELC grant manager; and develop a public/private partnership; DPI will contract for tribal EC liaison services.
(B)(1)	DCF Division of Early Care and Education (DECE), Bureau of Quality Improvement (BQI);	BQI administers YoungStar, and will lead the development and implementation of initiatives to improve key program components of YoungStar, the state's QRIS, including standards, rating, monitoring and training and technical assistance, and specific development of family engagement, inclusion/ health promotion, early intervention and assessment practices.
(B)(2)	DCF Division of Early Care and Education, BQI	BQI will lead specific initiatives aimed at increasing the number of programs that participate in or are aligned with YoungStar, and at increasing the rate of children with high needs who are enrolled in high quality programs.
(B)(3)	DCF Division of Early Care and Education, BQI	BQI will continue current rating and monitoring activities as well as a targeted outreach campaign aimed at increasing enrollment of high needs children in high quality programs.
(B)(4)	DCF Division of Early Care and Education, BQI	BQI will lead targeted professional development initiatives to improve program quality via increased educational qualifications. Initiatives include training & technical assistance, coaching and mentoring and improvements in training content.
(B)(5)	DCF Division of Early Care and Education, BQI	BQI manages the current YoungStar validation study contract; it will expand the scope of its contract to include specified additions.
(C)(1)	DPI Division for Academic Excellence, Office of Early Learning (OEL)	OEL will implement initiatives aimed at developing training in key domains of the early learning standards, professional development of trainers who deliver the training and mentoring/coaching activities for providers who receive the training, to ensure improved quality through appropriate application in program curriculum and activities.
(C)(2)	N/A	
(C)(3)	N/A	

Selection Criterion	Participating Party	Roles & Responsibilities/Type of Participation
(C)(4)	DCF Division of Early Care and Education, BQI DPI Division for Academic Excellence, OEL	DECE/BQI will develop a progression of family engagement standards for YoungStar in consultation with OEL. OEL will integrate these standards in prekindergarten and Head Start. Together they will develop and implement training and ongoing professional development activities that ensure standards are aligned and applied.
(D)(1)	DPI Division for Academic Excellence, OEL	OEL will lead a cross sector professional development activities to align program requirements, expand certification and degree programs and related activities intended to formalize, improve and expand the workforce and professional development system for ELD teachers and providers.
(D)(2)	N/A	
(E)(1)	N/A	
(E)(2)	DPI Division for Libraries and Technology (DLT) DCF Division of Management Services (DMS) /Bureau of Information Technology (BIT) and Bureau of Performance Management (BPM) DHS Division of Public Health (DPH)	DPI/DLT will oversee the development of the EC LDS expansion, within the context of the current interagency EC LDS Project Charter, including general build and connectivity activities across the three agencies. DCF/DMS/BIT will lead activities related to building analytic capacity of related DCF early childhood data warehouses and building connections between these warehouses and data sent/received across participating systems, via oversight of an IT contract team. DHS/DPH will build a customer hub across three internal data systems. Each agency will host research analysts dedicated to building its analytical capacity to report on and use data to inform policies and programs for children ages birth to school entry.
Competitive Preference Priority 2	DCF Department of Early Care and Education, BQI and Bureau of Early Care Regulation DPI Division for Academic Excellence, OEL	DECE/BECE administers child care regulation and will collaborate with BQI to increase the participation rate of all regulated child care programs in YoungStar. DPI/OEL will collaborate with DECE/BQI to align public prekindergarten programs with YoungStar standards.
Invitational Priority 5	DCF Department of Early Care and Education, RTTT ELC Project Manager and state staff	The RTTT ELC grant manager will collaborate with state staff, the Early Childhood Advisory Council and others to develop a competitive process to select a 501(c) (3) organization to establish an infrastructure that will secure private sector resources to expand the activities described in the state's RTTT ELC grant application.

BUDGET PART II: PARTICIPATING STATE AGENCY

BUDGET PART II -TABLES

Budget Table II-1: Participating State Agency Budget By Budget Category

DCF					
Participating State Agency-Level Budget Table II-1					
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(4)(b))					
Budget Category	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	335,300	397,700	397,700	397,700	1,528,400
2. Fringe Benefits	151,100	179,205	179,205	179,205	688,715
3. Travel	22,488	23,334	23,334	23,334	92,490
4. Equipment	9,700	0	0	0	9,700
5. Supplies	127,800	149,100	149,100	149,100	575,100
6. Contractual	1,919,069	2,036,294	1,562,794	1,159,294	6,677,451
7. Training Stipends	0	0	0	0	0
8. Other	80,000	79,500	79,500	79,500	318,500
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	2,645,457	2,865,133	2,391,633	1,988,133	9,890,356
10. Indirect Costs*	1,341	1,591	1,591	1,591	6,114
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, ... other partners	1,500,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	6,300,000
12. Funds set aside for grantee technical assistance	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	400,000
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	4,246,798	4,566,724	4,093,224	3,689,724	16,596,470
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	784,645	759,058	626,558	626,558	2,796,821
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	5,031,444	5,325,782	4,719,782	4,316,282	19,393,290

DPI					
Participating State Agency-Level Budget Table II-1					
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(4)(b))					
Budget Category	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	38,126	100,526	100,526	100,526	339,704
2. Fringe Benefits	12,974	37,822	37,822	37,822	126,440
3. Travel	7,300	7,300	7,300	7,300	29,200
4. Equipment	307,000	60,000	64,000	85,600	516,600
5. Supplies	36,150	56,450	56,954	52,950	202,504
6. Contractual	797,750	759,183	800,503	800,503	3,157,939
7. Training Stipends	0	0	0	0	0
8. Other	1,264	0	24,500	33,700	59,464
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	1,200,564	1,021,281	1,091,605	1,118,401	4,431,851
10. Indirect Costs*	10,167	13,786	14,128	13,786	51,868
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	0	0	0	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0	0	0	0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	1,210,731	1,035,067	1,105,733	1,132,187	4,483,719
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	1,075,342	1,033,675	433,675	433,675	2,976,367
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	2,286,073	2,068,742	1,539,408	1,565,862	7,460,086

DHS

**Participating State Agency-Level Budget Table II-1
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(4)(b))**

Budget Category	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	0	62,400	62,400	62,400	187,200
2. Fringe Benefits	0	27,805	27,805	27,805	83,415
3. Travel	0	0	0	0	0
4. Equipment	0	0	0	0	0
5. Supplies	0	21,300	21,300	21,300	63,900
6. Contractual	825,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	1,275,000
7. Training Stipends	0	0	0	0	0
8. Other	0	0	0	0	0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	825,000	261,505	261,505	261,505	1,609,515
10. Indirect Costs*	0	3,432	3,432	3,432	10,296
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	0	0	0	0	0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	0	0	0	0	0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	825,000	264,937	264,937	264,937	1,619,811
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	44,000
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	836,000	275,937	275,937	275,937	1,663,811

Budget Table II-2: Participating State Agency Budget By Project

DCF					
Participating State Agency-Level Budget Table II-2					
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(4)(b))					
Project	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
A-St Systems	411,142	391,258	391,258	391,258	1,584,918
B1- TQRIS	553,712	543,830	543,830	543,830	2,185,200
B2- Inc Prog	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	180,000
B3- Rating	0	0	0	0	0
B4-Hi Need	2,174,188	2,119,438	2,150,938	1,919,438	8,364,000
B5-Validate	438,200	457,500	0	0	895,700
C1- WMELS	0	0	0	0	0
C4-Fam Eng	156,350	268,350	268,350	268,350	961,398
D1-Crdent'ls	0	0	0	0	0
D2-Ed Suppt	0	0	0	0	0
E1-K Assess	0	0	0	0	0
E2-Data Syst	1,252,852	1,500,407	1,320,407	1,148,407	5,222,073
Inv Priority 5	0	0	0	0	0
<Project 14>	0	0	0	0	0
<Project 15>	0	0	0	0	0
Total Statewide Budget	5,031,444	5,325,782	4,719,782	4,316,282	19,393,290

DPI					
Participating State Agency-Level Budget Table II-2					
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(4)(b))					
Project	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
A-St Systems	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000	328,000
B1- TQRIS	0	0	0	0	0
B2- Inc Prog	0	0	0	0	0
B3- Rating	0	0	0	0	0
B4-Hi Need	0	0	0	0	0
B5-Validate	0	0	0	0	0
C1- WMELS	514,893	532,955	546,297	539,955	2,134,100
C4-Fam Eng	64,400	62,400	62,400	62,400	251,602
D1-Crdent'ls	286,566	246,899	246,403	244,399	1,024,267
D2-Ed Suppt	600,000	600,000	0	0	1,200,000
E1-K Assess	0	0	0	0	0
E2-Data Syst	738,214	544,488	602,308	637,108	2,522,117
Inv Priority 5	0	0	0	0	0
<Project 14>	0	0	0	0	0
<Project 15>	0	0	0	0	0
Total Statewide Budget	2,286,073	2,068,742	1,539,408	1,565,862	7,460,086

DHS					
Participating State Agency-Level Budget Table II-2 (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(4)(b))					
Project	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
A-St Systems	0	0	0	0	0
B1- TQRIS	0	0	0	0	0
B2- Inc Prog	0	0	0	0	0
B3- Rating	0	0	0	0	0
B4-Hi Need	0	0	0	0	0
B5-Validate	0	0	0	0	0
C1- WMELS	0	0	0	0	0
C4-Fam Eng	0	0	0	0	0
D1-Crdent'ls	0	0	0	0	0
D2-Ed Suppt	0	0	0	0	0
E1-K Assess	0	0	0	0	0
E2-Data Syst	836,000	275,937	275,937	275,937	1,663,811
Inv Priority 5	0	0	0	0	0
<Project 14>	0	0	0	0	0
<Project 15>	0	0	0	0	0
Total Statewide Budget	836,000	275,937	275,937	275,937	1,663,811

BUDGET PART II - NARRATIVE

As detailed in Section (A)(3)(a)(1), the Wisconsin RTTT-ELC grant will be implemented by three state agencies, the Department of Children and Families (DCF) as lead agency, the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) and the Department of Health Services (DHS).

1) Personnel

Department of Children and Families

DCF will act as the lead agency for Wisconsin's management of the RTTT ELC funds, including grant oversight and fiscal reporting. To accomplish this, DCF will hire seven full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

Grant Manager. A new 1.0 FTE Grant Manager will be located in the DCF DECE Administrator's Office, which is responsible for the overall grant administration. As noted in Part I, the Grant Manager's primary responsibility is to ensure the implementation of Wisconsin's RTTT ELC reform agenda across the participating state agencies (PSAs) and act as the formal RTTT-ELC liaison. The grant manager works directly with key managers at the Lead and Participating State Agencies to ensure effective implementation in accordance with the terms of the enclosed MOU and Scope of Work.

Program Assistant. A new 1.0 FTE Program Assistant will be located in the DCF DECE Bureau of Quality Improvement. It is critical to have an overall administrative support position to process, track and help with administering rapid ramp up of YoungStar and demand created the system. 1 FTE to support YoungStar and early childhood system work of the Early Childhood Advisory Council. The position will be in the Bureau of Quality Improvement.

Inclusion Coordinator/Early Intervention Consultant. A new 1.0 FTE Inclusion Coordinator/Early Intervention Consultant will be located in the DCF DECE Bureau of Quality Improvement. This position will provide more targeted and effective services to YoungStar program-enrolled children with delays or disabilities and their families. This position will coordinate across systems in DPI and DHS on inclusion issues, and with the Early Childhood Advisory Council Collaborating Partners Health Children Committee Screening and Assessment project team.

Professional Development Coordinator. A new 1.0 FTE Professional Development Coordinator will be located in the DCF DECE Bureau of Quality Improvement and is responsible for strengthening YoungStar state professional development capacity. Responsibilities will include development and oversight of increased contractual resources focused on working with the YoungStar Consortium, Institutions of Higher Education and providers on professional development needs. This support will be critical to DCF's goal of moving child care programs star levels from two to three stars.

Professional Development Analyst. A new 1.0 FTE Professional Development Analyst will be located in the DCF DECE Bureau of Quality Improvement and will be responsible for increasing training and technical assistance service delivery and creating new opportunities for on-site, coaching and mentoring; the position will also coordinate the department's professional development work with

that of the Wisconsin Professional Development Initiative. This support will be very important as DCF focuses on moving child care programs star levels from two to three stars.

Family Engagement Consultant. A new 1.0 FTE Family Engagement Consultant will be located in the Division of Early Care and Education, Bureau of Quality Improvement. This position will be responsible for developing a progression of standards for family engagement that will be used to determine mandatory points in YoungStar on family engagement across the star levels. The position will ensure that standards are aligned, as appropriate, with the Head Start family engagement standards and the Strengthening Families framework. The position will also develop training curricula and implementation resources for programs, and be responsible for organizing and leading the Community of Practice implementation.

Research Analyst. A new 1.0 FTE Research Analyst will be located in DCF's Division of Management Services, Bureau of Performance Management. This position will analyze, interpret and communicate information, using EC LDS data to answer defined policy questions, and act as a liaison to external system users and researchers.

Department of Public Instruction

The lead manager in DPI will be the current Assistant Superintendent of the Division for Academic Excellence, who will provide Department leadership in the development and implementation of professional development activities and an Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System. Supporting this effort will be three new positions funded by the RTTT-ELC.

Family Engagement Educational Consultant. A new 0.5 FTE Family Engagement Educational Consultant will be located in the Division for Academic Excellence Office of Early Learning. This position will be responsible for aligning public 4K and 5k family engagement standards with Head Start family engagement standards and family engagement standards developed for YoungStar child care providers. It includes involving families in their children's early learning and development and working with families to ensure a successful transition to kindergarten.

4K Coordinator. An existing LTE 4K Coordinator located in the Division for Academic Excellence Office of Early Learning will have 40 days added to the existing LTE allocation to work with DCF on 4K/YoungStar alignment, promoting 4K in community settings, and developing 4K relationships to child and program assessment activities in conjunction with sections B and C activities.

Research Analyst. A new 1.0 FTE Research Analyst will be located in DPI's Division for Academic Excellence Office of Early Learning. This position will analyze, interpret and communicate information, using EC LDS data to answer defined policy questions, and act as a liaison to external system users and researchers.

Department of Health Services

The Division Administrator for the Division of Public Health will serve as the lead manager for the Wisconsin Department of Health Services. The Public Health Division Administrator will ensure the development and implementation of an Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System, specifically efforts

to build a DPH Children Customer Hub. This hub would contain identification and record locator data for all children who have come in contact with the DPH, whether by birth, immunization or some other public health activity.

Research Analyst. A new 1.0 FTE Research Analyst will be located in the Division of Public Health, Office of Health Informatics, Health Analytics Section. This position will analyze, interpret and communicate information, using EC LDS data to answer defined policy questions, and act as a liaison to external system users and researchers.

As described above, these positions are requested as part of the RTT-ELC grant. Salary amounts are estimated based on the current salary structure in place, which is based on Wisconsin's current compensation plan for state positions.

Working Title	Classification	FTE	Hourly Salary	Annual Salary	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Totals
DCF:									
Grant Manager	Policy Initiatives Advisor-Admin	1.0	\$39.00	\$81,100	\$81,100	\$81,100	\$81,100	\$81,100	\$324,400
Research Analyst	Research Analyst-Advanced	1.0	\$30.00	\$62,400		\$62,400	\$62,400	\$62,400	\$187,200
Program Assistant	Office Management Specialist	1.0	\$15.00	\$31,200	\$31,200	\$31,200	\$31,200	\$31,200	\$124,800
Inclusion/EI Consultant	Nursing Consultant 1	1.0	\$24.60	\$51,200	\$51,200	\$51,200	\$51,200	\$51,200	\$204,800
PD Coordinator	Human Services Program Mgr	1.0	\$27.60	\$57,400	\$57,400	\$57,400	\$57,400	\$57,400	\$229,600
PD Analyst	Program & Policy Analyst Adv	1.0	\$25.00	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$208,000
Family Engagement Consultant	Program & Policy Analyst Adv	1.0	\$30.00	\$62,400	<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$249,600</u>
DCF Total					\$335,300	\$397,700	\$397,700	\$397,700	\$1,528,400
DPI:									
Family Engagement Consultant	Education Consultant	0.5	\$30.00	\$31,200	\$31,200	\$31,200	\$31,200	\$31,200	\$124,800
4K Coordinator	Education Consultant	0.2	\$21.64	\$6,926	\$6,926	\$6,926	\$6,926	\$6,926	\$27,704
Research Analyst	Research Analyst-Advanced	1.0	\$30.00	<u>\$62,400</u>		<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$187,200</u>
DPI Total					\$38,126	\$100,526	\$100,526	\$100,526	\$339,704
DHS:									
Research Analyst	Research Analyst-Advanced	1.0	\$30.00	\$62,400		<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$62,400</u>	<u>\$187,200</u>
DHS Total						\$62,400	\$62,400	\$62,400	\$187,200
Personnel Totals					\$373,426	\$560,626	\$560,626	\$560,626	\$2,055,304

2) Fringe Benefits

Fringe benefit rates are established each biennium for all Wisconsin agencies and include funding for FICA/Medicare, sick leave, unemployment compensation insurance, worker's compensation insurance, health, life and retirement benefits. The following rates have been applied to the salary costs for the participating agencies in this grant.

Department of Children & Families: 45.04%

Department of Public Instruction: 39.82%

Department of Health Services: 44.56%

Positions	Annual Salary	Annual Fringe	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Totals
DCF:							
Grant Manager	\$81,100	\$36,500	\$36,500	\$36,500	\$36,500	\$36,500	\$146,000
Research Analyst	\$62,400	\$28,105		\$28,105	\$28,105	\$28,105	\$84,315
Program Assistant	\$31,200	\$14,100	\$14,100	\$14,100	\$14,100	\$14,100	\$56,400
Inclusion/EI Consultant	\$51,200	\$23,100	\$23,100	\$23,100	\$23,100	\$23,100	\$92,400
PD Coordinator	\$57,400	\$25,900	\$25,900	\$25,900	\$25,900	\$25,900	\$103,600
PD Analyst	\$52,000	\$23,400	\$23,400	\$23,400	\$23,400	\$23,400	\$93,600
FE Consultant	\$62,400	\$28,100	<u>\$28,100</u>	<u>\$28,100</u>	<u>\$28,100</u>	<u>\$28,100</u>	<u>\$112,400</u>
DCF Total			\$151,100	\$179,205	\$179,205	\$179,205	\$688,715
DPI:							
FE Consultant	\$31,200	\$12,400	\$12,400	\$12,400	\$12,400	\$12,400	\$49,600
4K Coordinator	\$6,926	\$574	\$574	\$574	\$574	\$574	\$2,296
Research Analyst	\$62,400	\$24,848		<u>\$24,848</u>	<u>\$24,848</u>	<u>\$24,848</u>	<u>\$74,544</u>
DPI Total			\$12,974	\$37,822	\$37,822	\$37,822	\$126,440
DHS:							
Research Analyst	\$62,400	\$27,805		<u>\$27,805</u>	<u>\$27,805</u>	<u>\$27,805</u>	<u>\$83,415</u>
DHS Total				\$27,805	\$27,805	\$27,805	\$83,415
Total, Fringe			\$164,074	\$244,832	\$244,832	\$244,832	\$898,570

3) Travel

It is anticipated that some project staff will incur travel costs in conjunction with their roles in implementing the RTTT-ELC grant. Cost estimates are based on maximum allowable rates established by the State of Wisconsin, which includes mileage at \$0.465/mile, lodging expenses of \$70-\$80 depending on the city, and meals at \$8 for breakfast, \$9 for lunch and \$17 for dinner.

The travel expenditure estimates for the DCF Grant Manager are calculated as follows:

Mileage: 1 trip/month x 12 months at average of 200 miles per trip @ \$0.51/mile = \$1,224
 Lodging: 1 overnight stay every other month x 6 months @ \$75/night= \$450
 Meals: 1 overnight stay every other month x 6 months x \$51/trip (5 meals) = \$306
 1 trips every other month w/o overnight x 6 months x \$9/meal= \$54

Travel expenditure estimates for the DCF Inclusion/EI Consultant are calculated as follows:

Mileage: 4 trips/month x 12 months at average of 200 miles per trip @ \$0.465/mile = \$4,464
 Lodging: 10 overnight stays/year @ \$75/night = \$750
 Meals: 10 overnight stays/year x \$51/trip (5 meals) = \$510
 23 non-overnight trips/year x \$9/meal = \$276

Travel expenditure estimates for the DCF PD Coordinator and PD Analyst are calculated as follows:

Mileage: 2 trips/month x 12 months at average of 200 miles per trip @ \$0.465/mile = \$2,232
 Lodging: 14 overnight stays/year @ \$75/night = \$1,050
 Meals: 14 overnight stays/year x \$51/trip (5 meals) = \$714
 56 non-overnight trips/year x \$9/meal = \$504

Travel expenditure estimates for the DCF and DPI Family Engagement Consultants calculated as follows:

Mileage: 4 trips per month x 12 months at average of 200 miles per trip @ \$0.465/mile = \$4,464
 Lodging: 1 overnight stay per month x 12 months @ \$75/night= \$ 900
 Meals: 1 overnight stay per month x 12 months x \$51/trip (5 meals) = \$ 612
 3 trips per month w/o overnight x 12 months x \$9/meal= \$ 324

Positions	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Totals
DCF:					
Grant Manager	\$2,034	\$2,034	\$2,034	\$2,034	\$8,136
Inclusion/EI Consultant	\$5,157	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$23,157
PD Coordinator	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$18,000
PD Analyst	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$18,000
FE Consultant	<u>\$6,300</u>	<u>\$6,300</u>	<u>\$6,300</u>	<u>\$6,300</u>	<u>\$25,200</u>
DCF Total	\$22,488	\$23,334	\$23,334	\$23,334	\$92,490
DPI:					
FE Consultant	\$6,300	\$6,300	\$6,300	\$6,300	\$25,200
4K Coordinator	<u>\$1,000</u>	<u>\$1,000</u>	<u>\$1,000</u>	<u>\$1,000</u>	<u>\$4,000</u>
DPI Total	\$7,300	\$7,300	\$7,300	\$7,300	\$29,200
Total, Travel	\$29,788	\$30,634	\$30,634	\$30,634	\$121,690

4) Equipment

Implementation of the various components of this grant will require upgrades to the information technology infrastructure for the three participating agencies. New staff at DCF and DPI (EI/Inclusion Coordinator, Program Assistant, Professional Development Coordinator and Analyst, Family Engagement Consultants) each require computers, with costs ranging between \$1,900 - \$2000.

The contracted WMELS Coordinator at DPI will require \$39,000 to update, revise and maintain web-based training modules.

The ECLDS project will require the purchase of the following equipment:

- a) Servers for matching tool and for Early Childhood data retention for reports/dashboard display, including server purchase, server components and environment: \$300,000 purchase cost in Year 1, to be purchased by DPI.
- b) Maintenance Costs, Fees, Licenses: \$50,000 per year, evenly distributed years 2-4 (total = \$150,000), to be maintained and paid by DPI.
- c) Equipment for curriculum development and training regarding data-informed decision making, for local workers (e.g., in school districts, county social service offices, and early learning and development programs), to be purchased in year 4, by DPI:
 - c1) e-Learning software and hosting costs (Camptasia, Articulate): \$10,600
 - c2) Resources for module development (video equipment): \$15,000

Equipment Description	Unit Cost	Agency			Totals
		DCF	DPI	DHS	
Personal Computers	varies	\$9,700	\$2,000		\$11,700
Technology & maintenance (WMELS)			\$39,000		\$39,000
Servers			\$300,000		\$300,000
Maintenance cost, fees & licensing			\$150,000		\$150,000
e-learning software & hosts costs			\$10,600		\$10,600
Video equipment			\$15,000		\$15,000
Total, Equipment		\$9,700	\$516,600	\$0	\$526,300

5) Supplies

A standard annual supplies and services package is budgeted for each new position. The package includes communications (\$600), rent and premises maintenance (\$2,700), printing and supplies (\$300); miscellaneous services (\$900) and central office overhead rate (\$16,300). Note that DPI has additional supplies costs beyond this standard rate that are captured in the DPI data in the table below.

Agency	#	S&S	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
DCF	7.0	\$21,300	\$127,800	\$149,100	\$149,100	\$149,100	\$575,100
DPI	1.5	\$21,300	\$36,150	\$56,450	\$56,954	\$52,950	\$202,504
DHS	1.0	\$21,300		\$21,300	\$21,300	\$21,300	\$63,900
Total, Supplies			\$163,950	\$226,850	\$227,354	\$223,350	\$841,504

6) Contractual

As part of this project, the various participating agencies will contract for a number of products and professional services. The Departments will follow state procedures under Ch. 16 Wisconsin Statutes and federal procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.

Tribal Services. (DPI) Provide coordinate outreach and liaison services for early learning and development programs among the eleven federally recognized American Indian nations and tribal communities and State Government to assure the provision of quality services and programs for tribal young children. Specific activities include (1) conducting a survey of the array of early childhood programs (ex: tribal head start programs) & services available within each of the eleven American Indian nations and other tribal communities (ex: Milwaukee, Green Bay, etc.) in Wisconsin; (2) identifying formal and informal linkages, as well as barriers between the identified tribal programs/services and DCF, DPI, DHS programs/services at the state, county, school district levels, including but not limited to well child, home visiting, child care, Head Start, special education, and 4/5 year old kindergarten; (3) work within state professional development structures to improve (cultural) access to WMELS, pyramid model, literacy and other state EC initiatives; (4) explore mechanisms to strengthen communication, collaboration, and networking among the eleven federally recognized American Indian nations and tribal communities and with school districts, counties/state agencies on ELD issues & concerns; (5) identify key contacts and stakeholders within the and among counties, school districts and state agencies. (\$328,000)

Public-Private Partnership. (DCF) Provide seed funding for Wisconsin’s Early Childhood Advisory Council public-private partnership that would be matched by philanthropic entities to support initial organizational and implementation activities, including identifying staff resources, establishing governing documents, creating operational protocols, and determining fundable projects. (\$300,000)

Child Assessment Training. (DCF) Provide 70 training sessions total to improve child assessment skills in the provider community. Cost of \$1,000 per training for 35-50 participants per session. (\$70,025)

Stakeholder Meetings. (DCF) Facilitate stakeholder meetings related to 4K alignment, including room rental (if necessary), stipends, and mileage for parents, family members, program representatives, and community members to attend workgroup meetings. The meetings will be held at least monthly, with the possibility of some subgroups meeting in addition to the larger

meeting to formulate proposals for the 4K Task Force and encourage YoungStar participation. (\$80,000)

Professional Development Training & Support. (DCF) Provide facility specific professional development training, coaching and mentoring to child care providers. (\$903,350)

Child Care Provider Retention Bonuses. (DCF) Distribute one-time retention bonuses to child care providers who have moved up the quality rating scale and report on the outcome. (\$614,000)

YoungStar Evaluation. (DCF) Fund the Evaluation of YoungStar by fully funding the sample size and ECERS evaluation. (\$625,000)

WMELS. (DPI) Several current contracts will be expanded to achieve the goals of this application related to WMELS. These include:

- Expand current contract with DPI/CESA 10 for the services of a WMELS Coordinator, administrative support, stipends for trainer and onsite- training follow-up. (\$241,600)
- Expand current contracts with WMELS trainers to focus on targeted high needs areas, providing training and onsite training support. (\$72,000)
- Contract with WI Association for Infant Mental Health for Pyramid Model training. (\$273,600)
- Expand contracts with existing regional action teams (\$48,000)
- Align and expand WMELS early literacy training module (\$20,000)

High Needs Family Outreach Plan. (DCF) Develop a plan for promoting the message of the importance of early learning via targeted methods such as billboards, bus plaques, health care providers (physical, mental and behavioral), faith-based organizations, homeless shelters, domestic violence shelters, WIC sites, child welfare agencies, hair and nail salons, barber shops, laundry mats, grocery stores, and community center. The cost estimate of the high needs family outreach plan is \$25,000/yr for four years. (\$100,000).

Cross-Sector Professional Development. (DPI) Extend current contract with University of Wisconsin- Madison Waisman Center for the services of a professional development coordinator, administrative support, and TA networking event funds. (\$624,000). Provide web support for updating and maintaining web-based training modules via extension of current contract with CESA 5. (\$20,000) Expand child assessment training activities. (\$40,000)

EC LDS Project Manager. (DPI) Building on the current management structure of the WI ECLDS Project, DPI's Division for Libraries and Technology will contract for 1 FTE Project Manager to oversee ECLDS project activities, across the three participating agencies, for all four years of the grant. (\$666,400)

EC LDS IS Project Manager and Data Governance Specialist. (DPI) Additional IT staff will be contracted to work specifically on adding early childhood data to its existing LDS. These staff will be located in DPI's Division for Libraries and Technology. (\$541,450)

EC LDS Training Specialist. DPI will also contract with a Training Specialist in Years 3 and 4 to develop training curriculum for data use (developing training for state agency workers in Year 3 and local data users in Year 4). (\$66,640)

EC LDS Entity Resolution Solution Selection. (DPI) The Project Manager will work with the partnering agencies and other stakeholders to bring together data matching specialists to compare and select an appropriate open-source Entity Resolution (Data Matching). (\$21,250)

EC LDS Entity Resolution Solution Build. (DPI) The Project Manager will work with contract staff to operationalize the Entity Resolution Solution (matching tool). (\$42,500)

EC LDS Early Childhood Data Addition to Data Model and WISEdash Development. DPI will leverage its existing contract with the vendor VersaFit to add early childhood data to its current LDS and develop a presentation layer for data (to be utilized by all partnering agencies) via its current WISEdash product. This will allow the three agencies to display agreed upon data in reports and dashboards and ad hoc analysis by those with proper security clearance. Agreed upon data will be extracted, transformed (e.g., including removal of personally identifiable information, etc.), and loaded into the presentation tool. (\$152,499)

Create a DPH Children Customer Hub. (DHS) This hub would contain identification and record locator data for all children who have come in contact with the DPH, whether by birth, immunization or some other public health activity. The hub will initially connect data from three DPH programs: infant birth and death data within Vital Records; local health reporting data within the Secure Public Health Electronic Record (SPHERE), which includes state home visiting, Prenatal Care Coordination (PNCC), and maternal/child health program data; and the Wisconsin Immunization Registry (WIR). The hub can then be accessed as a single point connection that indicates the data available within DPH systems and as a record locator function for those authorized to pursue additional data from the individual systems. (\$1,275,000)

EC LDS DCF IT Team. (DCF) To maximize DCF's data reporting and analytical capabilities, the department will undertake three major initiatives via a contract with a dedicated and core project team (see table below). The team will be assembled via a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process. These initiatives will be revisited as project requirements are completed: (1) Build additional data analytic capacity within our existing data warehouses, focusing on the Child Care (first priority) and Child Welfare (second priority, if funding is available) data warehouses. This initiative would be approximately 40% of the DCF IT work effort. (2) Begin to merge the current disparate warehouses and combine into one DCF Enterprise warehouse the essential data elements matched across systems, such as child and family demographics, plus source keys indicating participation in the various DCF programs. This initiative would be approximately 40% of the DCF IT work effort. (3) Provide centralized data, from initiatives 1 and 2, to either be sent to other agencies identified in the ECLDS proposal or to be integrated with data received from other agencies. This initiative would be approximately 20% of the DCF IT work effort.

DCF Contract IT Team

	Project Manager	Business Analyst	Data Modeler	Data Match / ETL	Universe Design	Report Writer	Data Govern	DCF IT Team	
Staff #	1	2	0.5	2	0.5	0.5	1	7.5	
Hourly Rate	\$120	\$80	\$120	\$80	\$100	\$80	\$80		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	FTE	Total \$
Year 1	100%	100%	100%	60%	70%	70%	100%	6.4	\$1,158,000
Year 2	100%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	7.3	\$1,308,000
Year 3	100%	60%	70%	100%	100%	100%	70%	6.3	\$1,128,000
Year 4	100%	40%	60%	75%	100%	100%	60%	5.2	\$956,000
Total									\$4,550,000

The combination of these three initiatives will allow the State to see the ‘big picture’ regarding children and the programs in which their families participate. By not only increasing the depth and the amount of data collected, but by also focusing on merging the data together, this will allow DCF to participate in a complete and robust manner within Race to the Top and the ECLDS project. (\$3,984,376 grant request; \$565,624 DCF funds per Line 14 narrative).

Contract Title	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
DPI-Tribal Services	\$82,000	\$82,000	\$82,000	\$82,000	\$328,000
DCF-Public-Private Partnership	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$300,000
DCF-Child Assessment Training	\$22,725	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$70,725
DCF-Professional Development Training & Support.	\$259,750	\$208,700	\$226,200	\$208,700	\$903,350
DCF-Child Care Provider Retention Bonuses	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$214,000		\$614,000
DCF-YoungStar Evaluation	\$300,000	\$325,000			\$625,000
DPI-WMELS Coordinator	\$44,400	\$60,400	\$68,400	\$68,400	\$241,600
DPI-WMELS trainers	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$72,000
DPI-WMELS WI AIM	\$68,400	\$68,400	\$68,400	\$68,400	\$273,600
DPI-WMELS Regional Teams	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$48,000
DPI-WMELS Early Literacy	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$20,000
DCF-High Needs Family Outreach Plan	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$100,000
DPI-Cross-Sector PD Coordinator	\$156,000	\$156,000	\$156,000	\$156,000	\$624,000
DPI-CESA 4 Web	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$20,000
DPI-Assessment training	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$40,000
DPI ECLDS Project Manager	\$166,600	\$166,600	\$166,600	\$166,600	\$666,400
DPI .5 FTE IS Project Manager	\$83,300	\$83,300	\$83,300	\$83,300	\$333,200
DPI-Data Governance	\$83,300	\$41,650	\$41,650	\$41,650	\$208,250

Contract Title	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Specialist					
DPI-Training Specialist			\$33,320	\$33,320	\$66,640
DPI-Entity Resolution Selection	\$21,250				\$21,250
DPI Entity Resolution Solution Build	\$42,500				\$42,500
DPI-EC Data Addition to Data Model & WISEdash Development		\$50,833	\$50,833	\$50,833	\$152,499
DPH-Children Customer Hub	\$825,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$1,275,000
DCF ECLDS IT Team	\$1,016,594	\$1,166,594	\$986,594	\$814,594	\$3,984,376
Totals, Contractual	\$3,541,819	\$2,945,477	\$2,513,297	\$2,109,797	\$11,110,390

7) Training Stipends

No training stipends will be provided for this project.

8) Other

In addition to supplies costs related to positions, the RTTT-ELC grant would support a number of other initiatives to strengthen the early learning system in Wisconsin.

DCF:

Stakeholder Meetings. Facilitate stakeholder meetings around 4k alignment. These costs could include room rental (if necessary), stipends, and mileage for parents, program representatives, and community members to attend workgroup meetings. The meetings will be held at least monthly.

Family Engagement Standards. Funding will be provided to develop a progression of standards for family engagement that will be used to determine mandatory points in YoungStar family engagement across the star levels and develop curricula and implementation resources for programs. The estimate assumes 6 meetings at \$1,000/meeting (\$6,000) and 50 hours of curricula development at \$100/hour (\$5,000).

Community of Practice Meeting Support. Monthly Community of Practice meetings will be held in the five regions beginning in Year 2. The estimate assumes \$5,000 per each of the five regions per year to hold a combination of face to face and technology assisted meetings.

Technical Support Services. DCF's existing Business Intelligence (BI) infrastructure has capacity for this project, so no additional hardware or software costs. The DCF IT team will require Technical Support Services (TSS) such as database administrator, service support, firewall testing and/or security. The estimate for TSS is \$90,000 spread evenly over the life of the grant (\$22,500 per year).

Training. While it is expected that the DCF project team would use the new matching software at no additional cost, DCF estimates \$21,500 in one-time-cost for training the team on

this new software during the first year of the grant, and an additional \$21,000 for statistical and predictive analytics training for the team, split evenly over Years 2 through 4 (\$7,000 per year).

DPI

Data Governance Workshop. An inter-departmental Data Governance sub-committee is currently working with the federal SLDS State Support Team, to make recommendations for a WI ECLDS data governance structure. This planning work is expected to be completed by the end of 2012; therefore, implementation will begin in early 2013. RTTT-ELC funds will be used to bring together new governance committees for a one time workshop with the federal State Support Team. Project management (at DPI) will organize the workshop for approximately 35 people in Year 1 of the grant. Costs will include supplies and materials (\$464), as well as a room, food, and equipment (\$800), for a total of \$1,264.

Training for Data Users. DPI will lead efforts to develop and provide training for both state agency workers and local data users regarding the use of data to inform decisions, as well as use of dashboards and guided analysis. Three levels of training will be developed: (1) tutorial development and “push-button guides”; (2) using filters, selecting data, and reading graphs; and (3) analysis and interpretation of data results. Training (including curriculum, materials, and online-modules) will be developed in Year 3 by the contracted training specialist, in conjunction with DPI training area staff (in-kind work), and the three agencies’ research analysts. Local experts will be consulted for development of level 3 training for local data users in Year 4. All three levels of training will be provided, via a combination of online-modules and in-person, in year three to state agency staff. Training (modified as needed) will be provided to local data users in Year 4 via a combination of online-modules and webinars.

Plan & Development Meetings. In-person planning & development meetings for modules on local/public use of data to inform decisions. Includes eight days sub-contract work time for up to 10 data use leaders from around Wisconsin (\$100 per expert, per day); eight days of release time for up to three experts (CESA and others) (\$700 per person, per day); breakfast and lunch of work days (\$600 per day); hotel costs for those experts over 60 miles from destination (\$900 per day); and mileage for participants (\$800).

Dashboard & guided analysis workbook planning and design sessions Includes four days of sub-contract work time for up to 10 Wisconsin data leaders (\$100 per expert, per day); four days of release time for up to three experts (CESA and others) (\$700 per expert, per day); breakfast and lunch of work days (\$600 per day); hotel costs for those experts over 60 miles from destination (\$900 per day); and mileage for participants (\$800).

Webinar Training. DPI will hold four regionally-based two-day Professional Development Webinar trainings for school district administrators and appropriate county agency personnel to build content knowledge related to using district and EC state data to inform decisions and planning. Includes technology costs for Webinar; payment for one facilitator (\$700 per day); and supplies and materials (\$200 per day).

Activity	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
DCF-Stakeholder Meeting facilitation	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$100,000
DCF-FE Standards & Curriculum Development	\$11,000				\$11,000
DCF-Communities of Practice meeting support		\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$75,000
DPI Data Governance workshop	\$1,264				\$1,264
DCF-Training	\$21,500	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$42,500
DCF-Technical Support Services	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$90,000
DPI-plan & develop meetings			\$16,200	\$16,200	\$32,400
DPI-dashboard & guided analysis plan/design			\$8,300	\$8,300	\$16,600
DPI-webinar training-local data users				\$9,200	\$9,200
Total, other	\$81,264	\$79,500	\$104,000	\$113,200	\$377,964

9) Total Direct Costs

The budget by year across all categories of expenditures is shown below.

	<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Year 3</u>	<u>Year 4</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Totals	\$4,671,021	\$4,147,919	\$3,744,743	\$3,368,039	\$15,931,722

10) Indirect Costs

Each of the participating state agencies has a federally-approved indirect cost allocation plan by its cognizant federal agency. For DCF and DHS, the cognizant federal agency is the Department of Health and Human Services. For the DPI, the cognizant federal agency is the Department of Education. For this grant, the federally-approved indirect rate for each participating state agency is applied to the salary costs for the new individuals requested in the grant. The indirect rate applied for each agency is listed below. Note that DPI applies its indirect rate to its contracts as well as salaries, but we are not reflecting the contracts base for the indirect reimbursement in this table.

DCF: 0.40%
 DPI: 5.70%
 DHS: 5.50%

Agency	Annual Salary	Indirect Rate	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Totals
DCF	\$397,700	0.40%	\$1,341	\$1,591	\$1,591	\$1,591	\$6,114
DPI	\$100,526	5.70%	\$10,168	\$13,786	\$14,128	\$13,786	\$51,868
DHS	\$62,400	5.50%	\$0	\$3,432	\$3,432	\$3,432	\$10,296
Totals			\$11,509	\$18,809	\$19,151	\$18,809	\$68,278

11) Funds distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, or other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws.

The participating agencies will distribute funding to local agencies through MOUs, contracts, interagency agreements.

DCF:

T.E.A.C.H. Scholarships. Funding will be provided from this grant to supplement current funding for the Teacher Education and Compensation Helps (T.E.A.C.H.) program that provides scholarships for early childhood and school age providers to attend technical or private colleges or universities to achieve a higher educational level, by completing a specific

educational path. Funds are budgeted for at least 1,000 individuals at \$4,000 average scholarship. Funds will be prioritized to allow 2 star providers to access credit based education. Estimated minimum of 600 participants in 2 star programs would benefit over the 4 years; 200 participants in 3 star programs and 200 participants in 4 star programs. (\$1.5 million each year).

Family Engagement Standards Training. Provide professional development training to child care providers as well as other early care and education professionals. Twenty trainings per year in each of the five regions at \$1,000/training is \$100,000 per year in Years 2-4 for a total of \$300,000.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Totals
DCF:					
T.E.A.C.H. Scholarships	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$6,000,000
Family Engagement Standards Training		100,000	100,000	100,000	\$300,000
Totals	\$1,500,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$6,300,000

12) Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance

This RTTT-ELC grant application sets aside \$100,000 in each year of the grant for grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by the Department of Education or the Department of Health and Human Services, including travel costs. (\$400,000)

13) Total Funds Requested

	<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Year 3</u>	<u>Year 4</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Totals	\$6,282,530	\$5,866,728	\$5,463,894	\$5,086,848	\$22,700,000

14) Other Funds Allocated to the State Plan

As shown in Budget Table I-1 on line 14 (see Section VIII), Wisconsin will use a total of \$5,817,188 from other fund sources over the four year grant period to support the projects outlined in this State Plan. The fund sources, amounts planned for the grant period and activities by project are:

Child Care Development Block Grant funds from DCF at \$2,272,932. During year one and two DCF is paying \$270,700 for an evaluation of the implementation and outcomes from the initial startup of its quality rating system, YoungStar. This coincides with section B(5). The remaining CCDF funds support state staff working directly on the implementation and administration of YoungStar as it relates to section B(1); and partial support of a contracted IT team at DCF as specified in E(2).

DPI State General Purpose Revenue (GPR) of \$1,200,000, allocated by the Wisconsin legislature to support Lead to Read efforts.

DPI Head Start Collaboration Office funds at \$242,600. These funds represent 50% of the Head Start Collaboration Office Director’s time as it relates to section D(1) for the development of a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.

ARRA funds from DCF's ARRA Early Childhood Advisory Council grant will contribute a total of \$361,557. These funds include \$19,890 for 25% of two state staff who provide technical and administrative support for the ECAC. The support, as described in section A(3), will be for January through May of 2013 (five months). Also \$41,667 will support a cross-sector Professional Development coordinator as described in D(1) and a \$300,000 grant program in support of public/private initiatives, also described in A(3).

Braided funding from DPI totals \$1,492,100; this includes funding in the amount of \$529,860 that represents a mix of IDEA Preschool funds, McKinney Vento Homeless funds and Special Education Professional Development Grant. These funds represent four years of state staff support, at varying FTE levels ranging from 5% to 25%, for activities described in sections C(1) for early learning standards and E(2) for the longitudinal data system.

Braided funding from DCF totals \$204,000, for state staff support, at varying FTE levels ranging from 5% to 10%, for activities described in section E(2) for the longitudinal data system.

Braided funding from DHS totals \$44,000, for state staff support, at varying FTE levels ranging from 5% to 10%, for activities described in section E(2) for the longitudinal data system.

15) Total Statewide Budget

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$8,153,517	\$7,670,461	\$6,535,127	\$6,158,081	\$28,517,187

BUDGET: INDIRECT COST INFORMATION

To request reimbursement for indirect costs, please answer the following questions:

Does the State have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?

YES

NO

If yes to question 1, please provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (mm/dd/yyyy):

DCF: From: 07 / 01 / 2011 To: Until Amended Via HHS

DPI: From: 07 / 01 / 2012 To: 06 / 30 / 2013 Via ED

DHS: From: 07 / 01 / 2011 To: Until Amended Via HHS

Approving Federal agency: ED HHS Other

(Please specify agency): DCF and DHS via HHS DPI via ED

Directions for this form:

1. Indicate whether or not the State has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement that was approved by the Federal government.

2. If “No” is checked, the Departments generally will authorize grantees to use a temporary rate of 10 percent of budgeted salaries and wages subject to the following limitations:
 - (a) The grantee must submit an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency within 90 days after the grant award notification is issued; and
 - (b) If after the 90-day period, the grantee has not submitted an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency, the grantee may not charge its grant for indirect costs until it has negotiated an indirect cost rate agreement with its cognizant agency.

If “Yes” is checked, indicate the beginning and ending dates covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. In addition, indicate whether ED, HHS, or another Federal agency (Other) issued the approved agreement. If “Other” was checked, specify the name of the agency that issued the approved agreement

PART 6:

**RACE TO THE TOP – EARLY LEARNING CHALLENGE
PARTICIPATING STATE AGENCY
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**

This Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) is entered into by and between the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families (“Lead Agency”), the Wisconsin Department of Health Services (“Participating State Agency”) and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (“Participating State Agency”). The purpose of this agreement is to establish a framework of collaboration, as well as articulate specific roles and responsibilities in support of the State in its implementation of an approved Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant project.

I. ASSURANCES

The Participating State Agency hereby certifies and represents that it:

- 1) Agrees to be a Participating State Agency and will implement those portions of the State Plan indicated in Exhibit I, if the State application is funded;
- 2) Agrees to use, to the extent applicable and consistent with the State Plan and Exhibit I:
 - (a) A set of statewide Early Learning and Development Standards;
 - (b) A set of statewide Program Standards;
 - (c) A statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and
 - (d) A statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.
- 3) Has all requisite power and authority to execute and fulfill the terms of this MOU;
- 4) Is familiar with the State’s Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant application and is supportive of and committed to working on all applicable portions of the State Plan;
- 5) Will provide a Final Scope of Work only if the State’s application is funded and will do so in a timely fashion but no later than 90 days after a grant is awarded; and will describe the Participating State Agency’s specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, and key personnel (“Participating State Agency Plan”) in a manner that is consistent with the Preliminary Scope of Work (Exhibit I), with the Budget included in section VIII of the State Plan (including existing funds, if any, that the Participating State Agency is using for activities and services that help achieve the outcomes of the State Plan; and
- 6) Will comply with all of the terms of the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grant, this agreement, and all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR (34 CFR Parts 75, 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98 and 99).

II. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

A. PARTICIPATING STATE AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES

In assisting the Lead Agency in implementing the tasks and activities described in the State’s Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant application, the Participating State Agency will:

- 1) Implement the Participating State Agency Scope of Work as identified in the Exhibit I of this agreement;
- 2) Abide by the governance structure outlined in the State Plan;
- 3) Abide by the Participating State Agency's Budget included in section VIII of the State Plan (including the existing funds from Federal, State, private and local sources, if any, that the Participating State Agency is using to achieve the outcomes in the RTT-ELC State Plan);
- 4) Actively participate in all relevant meetings or other events that are organized or sponsored by the State, by the U.S. Department of Education ("ED"), or by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services ("HHS");
- 5) Post to any Web site specified by the State, ED, or HHS, in a timely manner, all non-proprietary products and lessons learned developed using Federal funds awarded under the RTT-ELC grant;
- 6) Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by the State, ED, or HHS;
- 7) Be responsive to State, ED, or HHS requests for project information including on the status of the project, project implementation, outcomes, and any problems anticipated or encountered, consistent with applicable local, State and Federal privacy laws.

B. LEAD AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES

In assisting the Participating State Agencies in implementing their tasks and activities described in the State's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge application, the Lead Agency will:

- 1) Work collaboratively with, and support the Participating State Agency in carrying out the Participating State Agency Scope of Work, as identified in Exhibit I of this agreement;
- 2) Timely award the portion of Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant funds designated for the Participating State Agency in the State Plan during the course of the project period and in accordance with the Participating State Agency's Scope of Work, as identified in Exhibit I, and in accordance with the Participating State Agency's Budget, as identified in section VIII of the State's application;
- 3) Provide feedback on the Participating State Agency's status updates, any interim reports, and project plans and products;
- 4) Keep the Participating State Agency informed of the status of the State's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant project and seek input from the Participating State Agency, where applicable, through the governance structure outlined in the State Plan;
- 5) Facilitate coordination across Participating State Agencies necessary to implement the State Plan; and
- 6) Identify sources of technical assistance for the project.

C. JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1) The Lead Agency and the Participating State Agency will each appoint a key contact person for the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant.
- 2) These key contacts from the Lead Agency and the Participating State Agency will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU, consistent with the State Plan and governance structure.
- 3) Lead Agency and Participating State Agency personnel will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the grant period.
- 4) Lead Agency and Participating State Agency personnel will negotiate in good faith toward achieving the overall goals of the State's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant, including when the State Plan requires modifications that affect the Participating State Agency, or when the Participating State Agency's Scope of Work requires modifications.

D. STATE RECOURSE IN THE EVENT OF PARTICIPATING STATE AGENCY'S FAILURE TO PERFORM

If the Lead Agency determines that the Participating State Agency is not meeting its goals, timelines, budget, or annual targets, or is in some other way not fulfilling applicable requirements, the Lead Agency will take appropriate enforcement action, which could include initiating a collaborative process by which to attempt to resolve the disagreements between the Lead Agency and the Participating State Agency, or initiating such enforcement measures as are available to the Lead Agency, under applicable State or Federal law.

III. MODIFICATIONS

This Memorandum of Understanding may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the parties involved, in consultation with ED.

IV. DURATION

This Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective, beginning with the date of the last signature hereon and, if a Race to the Top- Early Learning Challenge grant is received by the State, ending upon the expiration of the Race to the Top- Early Learning Challenge grant project period.

V. SIGNATURES

Authorized Representative of Lead Agency:

Eloise Anderson, Secretary Date
Wisconsin Department of Children and Families

Authorized Representative of Participating State Agency:

Dennis G. Smith, Secretary Date
Wisconsin Department of Health Services

Authorized Representative of Participating State Agency:

Tony Evers, State Superintendent Date
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

EXHIBIT I – PARTICIPATING STATE AGENCY SCOPE OF WORK

The Participating State Agency hereby agrees to participate in the State Plan, as described in the State’s application, and more specifically commits to undertake the tasks and activities described in its preliminary Scope of Work below.

Selection Criterion	Participating Party	Type of Participation
A(3)	<p>Department of Children & Families, <i>Division of Early Care and Education (DECE)</i></p> <p>Department of Public Instruction, <i>Division of Academic Excellence (DAE), Office of Early Learning (OEL)</i></p>	Implementation & Management. As the Governor’s designated lead state agency, DCF will employ a project manager with overall authority to carry out and enforce the tasks and activities described in this application under the terms specified in this MOU, ensuring all fiscal, policy and program activities are effectively implemented and federal requirements met, and acting as the formal grant liaison to the state advisory council to ensure grant activities advance/ are informed by its recommendations. DPI/DAE/OEL will ensure improvements in the quality of tribal early learning programs via a formal liaison between Tribes, DCF, DPI and DHS.
B(1)	Department of Children & Families, <i>Division of Early Care and Education/ Bureau of Quality Improvement (DECE/BQI)</i>	Accelerated QRIS program improvements. DECE/BQI, in collaboration with DPI and DHS, will lead the development and implementation of initiatives to improve key program components of YoungStar, the state’s QRIS, including family engagement, inclusion and assessment practices.
B(2)	Department of Children & Families, <i>DECE/BQI</i>	Increased QRIS Participation - DECE/BQI will lead specific initiatives aimed at (a) increasing the number of programs that participate in or are aligned with YoungStar, in collaboration with DPI for public prekindergarten and Head Start programs; and (b) increasing participation in quality programs of children with high needs by targeting outreach to families involved in the child welfare system and Wisconsin Works (W-2), the state’s TANF program.
B(3)	Department of Children & Families, <i>DECE/BQI</i>	Rating and Monitoring – DECE/BQI will continue current rating and monitoring activities as well as a targeted outreach campaign aimed at increasing enrollment of high needs children in high quality programs.
B(4)	Department of Children & Families, <i>DECE/BQI</i>	Improve program quality. DECE/BQI will implement specific professional development

Selection Criterion	Participating Party	Type of Participation
		initiatives, targeted to providers in high needs areas, to improve program quality via increased educational qualifications. Initiatives include training & technical assistance, coaching and mentoring and improvements in training content. Target populations include 2 star rated providers and providers who are former W-2 recipients.
B(5)	Department of Children & Families, <i>DECE/BQI</i>	Expand QRIS Validation Study. DECE/BQI will expand the scope of the current YoungStar validation study to include additional specified assessments and surveys.
C(1)	Department of Public Instruction, <i>Division of Academic Excellence (DAE), Office of Early Learning (OEL)</i>	Expand Early Learning Standards professional development activities. The DAE OEL will implement initiatives aimed at developing training in key domains of the early learning standards, professional development of trainers who deliver the training and mentoring/coaching activities for providers who receive the training, to ensure improved quality through appropriate application in program curriculum and activities.
C(4)	Department of Children & Families, <i>DECE/BQI</i> Department of Public Instruction, <i>DAE/OEL</i>	Develop & implement family engagement standards in early learning and development programs. DECE/BQI in collaboration with DAE/OEL will develop a progression of family engagement standards for YoungStar. DAE/OEL will integrate these standards in prekindergarten and Head Start. Together they will develop and implement training and ongoing professional development activities that ensure standards are aligned and applied.
D(1)	Department of Public Instruction, <i>DAE/OEL</i>	Cross Sector Professional Development Alignment. DAE/OEL will build on existing efforts to articulate preservice higher education credits at post-secondary institutions with the child care Registry program and the state's teacher licensing system, aligning program requirements and expanding certification and degree programs so as to develop pathways for provider progression along a career path and targeting providers in lower rated programs to ensure opportunities for quality improvement via education.
E(2)	Department of Children & Families, <i>Division of Management Services/Bureau of</i>	Accelerate Implementation of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System. DLT will oversee the development of the EC

Selection Criterion	Participating Party	Type of Participation
	<p><i>Information Technology (DMS/BITS) and Bureau of Performance Management (PBM)</i></p> <p>Department of Public Instruction, <i>Division for Libraries and Technology (DLT)</i></p> <p>Department of Health Services, <i>Division of Public Health (DPH)</i></p>	<p>LDS expansion, within the context of the current interagency EC LDS Project Charter, including general build and connectivity activities across the three agencies.</p> <p>DMS/BITS will lead activities related to building analytic capacity of related DCF early childhood data warehouses and building connections between these warehouses and data sent/received across participating systems.</p> <p>DPH will build a customer hub across three internal data systems.</p> <p>Each agency will host staff dedicated to building its analytical capacity to report on and use data to inform policies and programs for children ages birth to school entry.</p>
Competitive Preference Priority 2	<p>Department of Children & Families, <i>DECE/BQI and Bureau of Early Care Regulation (BECR)</i></p> <p>Department of Public Instruction, <i>DAE/OEL</i></p>	<p>Expand & Align ELD Programs with YoungStar. DECE/BECE and BQI will collaborate to increase the participation rate of all regulated child care programs in YoungStar. DAE/OEL will collaborate with DECE/BQI to align public prekindergarten programs with YoungStar standards.</p>
Invitational Priority 5	<p>Department of Children & Families, <i>Division of Early Care and Education (DECE)</i></p>	<p>Establish Public-Private Partnership. The RTTT ELC project manager will develop a competitive process to select a 501(c)(3) entity to develop an infrastructure to secure private investments to expand the activities described in the state's RTTT ELC grant application.</p>

Eloise Anderson, Secretary
WI Department of Children and Families

Date

Dennis G. Smith, Secretary
WI Department of Health Services

Date

Tony Evers, Superintendent
WI Department of Public Instruction

Date