

# Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge 2014 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

## Michigan



JUNE 2015



Race to the Top  
Early Learning Challenge

## Table of Contents

<b>APR Cover Sheet</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Certification</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Successful State Systems</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Governance Structure .....	10
Stakeholder Involvement .....	10
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	10
Participating State Agencies.....	11
<b>High-Quality, Accountable Programs</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	12
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application) .....	15
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	17
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	21
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	22
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) .....	25
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) .....	26
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	29
<b>Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)</b> .....	<b>30</b>
Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application).....	31
Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) .....	33
Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application) .....	35
<b>Early Childhood Education Workforce</b> .....	<b>36</b>
Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application) .....	36
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1).....	37
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2).....	39
<b>Measuring Outcomes and Progress</b> .....	<b>41</b>
Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application) .....	41
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application) .....	42
<b>Data Tables</b> .....	<b>43</b>
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	43
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs .....	44
Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age .....	45
Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	46
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.....	48

Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State .....	51
Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards.....	53
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State.....	54
<b>Budget and Expenditure Tables .....</b>	<b>55</b>
Budget Summary Table .....	55
Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Management and Governance .....	57
Budget Table: Project 2 – Improving Quality through Increased Participation in Great Start to Quality .....	59
Budget Table: Project 3 – Promotion of Physical and Social-Emotional Health.....	61
Budget Table: Project 4 – Enhancing Great Start to Quality System.....	63
Budget Table: Project 5 – Improving the Early Learning Child Care Workforce.....	65
Budget Table: Project 6 – Measuring Outcomes for Children, Programs, & Educators.....	67
Budget Table: Project 7 – Increasing Family Engagement .....	69

**Note:** All information in this document was prepared and submitted by the **Grantee** as their annual performance report (APR). For reference, the instructions and prompts from the approved APR form are included in italics throughout the document. Check marks in tables indicate the Grantee selected the option. A blank cells in a table indicates that the Grantee did not provide data or did not select the option.



## APR Cover Sheet

### General Information

1. PR/Award #: 412A130044

2. Grantee Name: Office of the Governor, State of Michigan

3. Grantee Address: 111 S Capitol, Lansing, Michigan, 48909

4. Project Director Name: Susan Broman

Title: Deputy Superintendent, Office of Great Start, Michigan Department of Education

Phone #: (517) 335-4092 Fax #: (517)-335-0592

Email Address: bromans@michigan.gov

### Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014

### Indirect Cost Information

#### 6. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?  Yes  No

b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government?  Yes  No

c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): 10/01/2013 to 09/30/2014

Approving Federal agency:  ED  HHS  Other (Please specify):



## Certification

**The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:**

The Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting 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))

Yes  No

Programs authorized under section 619 of part B and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Yes  No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

Yes  No

**To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.**

**Signed by Authorized Representative**

**Name:** Michael P. Flanagan

**Title:** State Superintendent

## Executive Summary

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

Strengthened investment in high-quality early learning and development continues to energize educational improvement efforts in Michigan. From the governor's office and the legislature to local providers, business leaders, schools, and families, people are deeply committed to improving opportunities for young children with high needs in Michigan. In 2013, the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Great Start (MDE-OGS) held conversations with 1,400 parents of young children, educators, business leaders, and local and state program directors to inform development of a statewide plan to achieve Governor Snyder's stated outcomes for young children:

- Children are born healthy.
- Children are healthy, thriving and developmentally on track from birth to third grade.
- Children are developmentally ready to succeed in school at the time of school entry.
- Children are prepared to succeed in fourth grade and beyond by reading proficiently at the end of third grade.

The resulting publication entitled "Great Start, Great Investment, Great Future: The Plan for Early Learning and Development in Michigan" illustrates that Michigan citizens recognize the vital foundation that a system rich in parent involvement, community and state collaboration, and high-quality accessible early learning and development programs can provide for our youngest citizens.

Drawing from the guiding principles of this plan and with the identified outcomes for young children as a focal point, in 2013 Michigan submitted a comprehensive application for a Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) competitive federal grant. As a result, Michigan was awarded \$51,737,456 for the purposes of improving early learning and development in the state over a period of four years, beginning January 2014 and ending December 2017. The grant is focused on the improvement of early childhood systems through: increasing access to high-quality programs for children with high needs; implementing and coordinating an integrated system of programs; and evaluating and rating program quality.

The Michigan Department of Education, Office of Great Start was identified as the lead agency for RTT-ELC implementation in the grant application. Michigan has prioritized its work into seven projects for improving early childhood outcomes for all children. These projects are designed to support the creation of a truly collaborative system of early learning and development - one that requires the collective efforts of policymakers, program directors, providers, and parents. The projects are as follows:

1. Grant Management and Governance;
2. Improving Quality through Increased Participation in Great Start to Quality;
3. Promotion of Physical and Social-Emotional Health;
4. Enhancing and Increasing Access to the Great Start to Quality System;
5. Improving the Early Learning and Development Workforce;
6. Measuring Outcomes for Children, Programs, & Educators; and
7. Increasing Family Engagement.

To execute these projects effectively, Michigan's RTT-ELC initiative involves the following key partners: the Early Childhood Investment Corporation; Michigan Department of Community of Health; Michigan Department of

Human Services; the Center for Educational Performance and Information within the Michigan Department of Technology, Management and Budget; and the Michigan Association for the Education of Young Children.

Through the various activities and initiatives within the seven RTT-ELC projects, we are striving to meet the following goals:

1. Increase access for children with high needs to high-quality early learning programs;
2. Increase opportunities for licensed and unlicensed home-based providers to improve the quality of their programs;
3. Ensure meaningful engagement of families in their children's early learning and development;
4. Promote children's physical, social, and emotional health;
5. Expand education and professional learning opportunities, especially for home-based providers;
6. Build an early learning data system that provides information (anonymously and in aggregate) on children across departments and programs.

The majority of the first of year of Michigan's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grant was dedicated to the planning and the development of grant infrastructure. The progress and quality of accomplishments achieved during this time have provided a solid foundation for effective implementation moving forward. Key accomplishments related to grant implementation infrastructure include:

- Majority of RTT-ELC positions staffed or in process;
- Scopes of work and budgets developed and approved for all seven projects and partner organizations;
- Presentations conducted on various projects for the purposes of alignment and integration of efforts;
- Grant implementation group established and convened to ensure communication and coordination;
- Written agreements negotiated between the majority of RTT-ELC partner agencies and organizations;
- Monitoring plans, procedures and mechanisms established and implemented;
- Technical assistance plan developed; and
- Communication plans and mechanisms (i.e. webpage, partner portal) developed or in process.

Upon hire or assignment within their respective agencies/organizations, staff supporting Michigan's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Grant spent a significant amount of time aligning the scopes of work across projects, partner organizations, and budgets; recruiting and hiring additional staff; and negotiating and finalizing agreements and monitoring protocols. These critical elements will ensure successful start-up of all projects as we enter year two of the grant focused on full implementation, coordination and integration of efforts, programmatic and fiscal monitoring, and maximizing results for Michigan children and families. While significant progress was made in establishing necessary grant infrastructure, key challenges in Year 1 included the extent of effort, time, and persistence needed to launch an initiative of this magnitude across multiple partners. The infrastructure development for such a cross-sector effort required longer than anticipated timelines, including the hiring of staff. Michigan also relies heavily on several vendors and multiple state agencies to execute the projects outlined in our approved Race to the Top Early-Learning Challenge Grant scope of work. This arrangement requires a significant amount of collaboration and coordination to ensure the timely execution and management of RTT-ELC initiatives and activities. The newly formed Grant Implementation Group (GIG), comprised of key staff from RTT-ELC partner agencies/organizations, continues to prioritize and move forward with hiring processes and project implementation efforts to meet established timelines and targets within our approved scope of work. The GIG will maintain approximately 12-15 members and will meet a minimum of bimonthly.

Michigan's RTT-ELC Year 1 early learning developments, accomplishments, and challenges are organized by the five key areas defined by the federal RTT-ELC competition:

### **1. Establishing Successful State Systems**

In establishing the Office of Great Start in 2011, Governor Snyder laid out OGS's charge to (a) align, consolidate, and/or integrate early childhood funding and related programs around the state's early childhood outcomes, and (b) coordinate the state's policy, budget, and programs for early childhood. As such, OGS coordinates and aligns the state's early learning and development investments for children with high needs in close and regular collaboration with senior staff from the Michigan Departments of Community Health (DCH) and Human Services (DHS) and the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC) to work toward achievement of our early childhood outcomes. OGS oversees the ECIC's implementation of our tiered quality rating and improvement system. OGS also partners with Michigan's intermediate school districts (ISDs) to ensure coordination between state level early childhood efforts and that of local early childhood collaborative bodies and parent coalitions, with the goal of balancing both local and state perspectives in decision making, accountability, and policy. Through RTT-ELC initiatives, Michigan works to further strengthen this coordination and collaboration both across partner agencies and across state and local networks.

- The progress made toward these efforts in Year 1 include:
- Establishment of an RTT-ELC Grant Implementation Group, inclusive of representation from partner organizations;
- Development of early childhood lead staff position descriptions for both the current Department of Community Health and Department of Human Services;
- Identification of RTT-ELC initiatives that will benefit from local and stakeholder input/involvement;

Establishment of the Office of Great Start Advisory Council to help identify and define policy issues, use local experiences to improve state policy, and identify how best to communicate with key stakeholders across OGS initiatives, including RTT-ELC. The 18-member council is inclusive of parents, local providers, and other community leaders from diverse economic and geographic backgrounds. The body will be consulted with and updated on RTT-ELC projects when appropriate.

### **2. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children**

Michigan is committed to ensuring that children with high needs have greater access to high-quality early learning programs, wherever such programs are delivered. Great Start to Quality (GSQ), our tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, is essential to achieving that goal. Through RTT-ELC, Michigan will develop and implement effective strategies for improving the quality of early learning programs by increasing participation in Great Start to Quality. Michigan's first goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to significantly increase access to high-quality early learning and development programs for children with high needs. In Michigan, center-based early learning programs and group homes are licensed, home-based providers are registered and individuals who enroll to care for children eligible for child care subsidies are considered unlicensed, subsidized. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Increase unlicensed provider participation in GSQ by providing training and consultation to support quality improvement of unlicensed providers;
- Increase home-based provider participation in GSQ in target communities through placement of regional Quality Improvement Specialists offering outreach and individualized technical assistance;



- Increase licensed provider participation in Great Start to Quality through participation bonuses targeted toward providers serving families at or below 185% of the federal poverty level;
- Increase licensed provider participation in Great Start to Quality through targeted offering of Quality Improvement Grants;
- Support licensing consultants to become ambassadors for Great Start to Quality (GSQ).

The progress made toward these efforts in year 1 include:

- Development of the draft Implementation Plan for the unlicensed, subsidized provider cohort project, including deployment of contracts supporting this work;
- Finalization of contracts for Great Start to Quality Resource Centers in targeted regions to increase participation for family/group home providers in high-need communities;
- Development of draft eligibility criteria and an implementation plan for the Great Start to Quality participation incentives;
- Establishment of access to Great Start to Quality STARS platform - Michigan's online platform where providers receive their star rating - for Bureau of Children and Adult Licensing (BCAL) licensing consultants;
- Planning for Quality Improvement Grants, also designed to increase participation of licensed/registered providers in Great Start to Quality.

Michigan's second goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to realize an early learning and development system with improved access for families and children to high-quality early learning programs and services. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Encourage participation of tribal and early childhood special education programs (ECSE/619) in GSQ through system enhancements and stronger relationships with these programs;
- Streamline program monitoring efforts to allow licensing consultants to increase focus on improving program quality;
- Increase access to high-quality early learning and care programs in Pathways to Potential communities by providing scholarships;
- Conduct outreach to families in Pathways to Potential communities to increase the percentage of families accessing high-quality early learning and development programs.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 1 include:

- Establishment of a participation process for tribal programs interested in accessing Great Start to Quality, including unique identification codes;
- Completion of necessary procurement processes for key licensing indicator pilot;
- Development of a Michigan Department of Human Services position description for a Departmental Specialist to provide critical support and assistance administering departmental responsibilities relating to RTT-ELC and to connect and align early childhood funding and programs across departments.

Michigan also plans to promote early learning and development outcomes for children by expanding and improving efforts to engage families in meaningful ways and support their development as leaders for their own children and communities. Efforts will focus on increasing family access to skill development resources designed to promote the physical, social, and emotional health of their children. Therefore, Michigan's third goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to invest in family engagement and education strategies designed to increase access to

high-quality early learning programs with an emphasis in Pathways to Potential communities. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Incorporate Strengthening Families Protective Factors into the Great Start to Quality program standards;
- Place Family Engagement Consultants in target communities to support parents and providers;
- Provide training modules about the Great Start to Quality Family and Community Partnerships standards;
- Assist families and providers in understanding and adopting protective factors into daily practice;
- Establish and coordinate networks of trusted advisors able to provide support to families in their local communities;
- Develop and distribute supplemental materials to support family understanding and interpretation of Kindergarten Entry Assessment data.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 1 include:

- Development of a position description for a Family Engagement Specialist within the Office of Great Start to lead RTT-ELC efforts focusing on increasing family engagement.

### **3. Defining High-Quality, Accountable Programs**

Michigan also plans to assist families and providers of early learning and care in supporting the healthy development and well-being of children with high needs. Michigan will accomplish this goal by building on efforts already underway across the state to increase healthy behaviors through education and personal action. Through RTT-ELC, these efforts will increase the availability of high-quality early learning programs that meet the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children, with a focus on Pathways to Potential communities. Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to help create an early learning and development system that supports the physical and social-emotional development of children from birth to 8 years of age.

The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Align Great Start to Quality program standards with nationally recognized physical and social-emotional health standards;
- Develop training and technical assistance materials and supports that promote both healthy habits for families and providers, as well as developmental screening and referral procedures;
- Provide consultants to support home-based providers in meeting the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 1 include:

- Collaborative meetings between MDE and DCH staff to update and improve project plans, review draft interagency agreements, and review sub-recipient monitoring plans and requirements. Based on these meetings, resources and staffing have been realigned to meet project expectations. Position descriptions were drafted in Year 1 and will be moved forward in Year 2 to assure measurable progress.

### **4. Supporting a Strong Early Childhood Education Workforce**

Research shows the positive impact of a quality early childhood educator on a child's development. Therefore, Michigan is focused on ensuring that early childhood educators have the skills and knowledge they need to be successful. While supporting early childhood educators statewide, Michigan's RTT-ELC initiatives will also target

home-base providers who serve high needs children in their programs. Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is that every young child in Michigan has access to an effective early childhood educator by 2020. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Expand online Child Development Associate (CDA) credential programs for early childhood educators;
- Increase the number of National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accredited community college early learning programs;
- Expand opportunities for home-based providers to earn a degree, as well as increase the supply of staff qualified to teach in Michigan's Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP), through Teacher Education And Compensation Helps (T.E.A.C.H.) scholarships;
- Increase access to training focused on achieving Great Start to Quality (GSQ) standards for program administration.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 1 include:

- Hiring and training of qualified MIAEYC staff to support RTT-ELC project work;
- Provision of 66 T.E.A.C.H. scholarships to eligible providers for fall 2014 semester, including 41 scholarships to home-based providers and 25 scholarships to providers seeking certification to teach in GSRP.

## **5. Measuring Outcomes and Progress**

Michigan plans to include data for all federal and state funded early learning programs in the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (MSLDS). This will enable the state to better understand the quality of care and education experiences of our youngest learners. Michigan will ensure that these data are also available to families, educators, researchers, and others needing access to data to support early learning improvements. Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to build an early learning data system that provides aggregated data across departments and programs. The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Create a management structure that will plan, organize, regulate, and guide the collection of, access to, and use of MSLDS data;
- Improve the existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System (MSLDS) to create links to essential early childhood data elements;
- Increase access to data to improve program delivery and effectiveness, to inform resource investment and policy decisions, and to empower families to make better decisions for their children;
- Improve data collection about early childhood educators to help improve policies that impact Michigan's early childhood educators.

The progress made toward these efforts in year 1 include:

- Hiring and training of Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) staff to support RTT-ELC project work;
- Initial testing of a voluntary Unique Identifier Code (UIC) assignment tool to inform the pilot project with Head Start grantees across the state;
- Regular convening of the Head Start Data Advisory Group, comprised of local grantee leadership and staff, to design and provide input into the UIC assignment and data upload process and related pilot project.

As stated previously, the overall challenges across all Year 1 RTT-ELC efforts were related to a longer than anticipated timeline for the development of grant implementation infrastructure. As such, original projections for activities and initiatives were adjusted as much as possible during scope of work revisions to align with this reality. As Michigan begins implementation of Year 2, communication, stakeholder engagement, and coordination of efforts will be a major focus. Imminent and ongoing efforts will include:

- Finalization and launch of overall and project-specific communication plans and strategies to increase public awareness of and engagement in RTT-ELC initiatives;
- Coordination of stakeholder engagement on a variety of RTT-ELC initiatives including Great Start to Quality incentives, parent engagement strategies, and potential specialized consultation models;
- Convening of Grant Implementation Group for the purposes of contribution alignment and results-focused strategic planning;
- Finalization of Great Start to Quality proposed evaluation model for federal approval and competitive bid;
- Engagement in continuous quality improvement processes to ensure efficient and effective grant infrastructure, implementation, and monitoring efforts.

## Successful State Systems

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

---

### Governance Structure

---

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

Participating State Agencies responsible for the implementation of grant projects and activities are the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH), the Michigan Department of Human Services (MDHS), and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI), within the Michigan Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB). The Lead Agency for the grant continues to be MDE, with the MDE Office of Great Start leading the implementation, management, and cross-partner collaboration efforts of the grant. In addition, the Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC) and Michigan Association for the Education of Young Children (MiAEYC) are participating partner organizations and have significant responsibility for implementing numerous grant activities. Representatives from all partner agencies and organizations serve on the Grant Implementation Group for the purposes of coordination, communication, and collaboration.

---

### Stakeholder Involvement

---

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

Michigan recognizes that coordination and collaboration in a comprehensive early learning and development system must go beyond state agencies and partner organizations to engage with key early childhood stakeholders from local communities across the state. As such, the Office of Great Start established the OGS Advisory Council in October 2014 to help identify and define policy issues, use local experiences to improve state policy, and identify how best to communicate with key stakeholders. The 18-member council is inclusive of parents, local providers, and other community leaders from diverse economic and geographic backgrounds. In addition, OGS has identified multiple RTT-ELC activities and initiatives that will benefit from targeted stakeholder engagement efforts including Great Start to Quality incentive programs, family engagement strategies, and proposed specialized consultation models. Such engagement efforts will ramp up in Year 2 of RTT-ELC.

---

### Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

---

*Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had or will have an impact on the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact and any anticipated changes to the RTT-ELC State Plan as a result.*

As part of an Executive Order, it is expected that Governor Rick Snyder will merge the Michigan Departments of Human Services and Community Health. The merger allows the new agency to better deliver the services

individuals and families need, with less fragmentation, working more collaboratively internally and with partners at the Departments of Education and Civil Rights. The vision for the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services is to promote better health outcomes, reduce health risks, and support stable and safe families while encouraging self-sufficiency.

---

## Participating State Agencies

---

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

There have been no changes in participation and/or commitment by any Participating State Agency or partner organization.

## High-Quality, Accountable Programs

### Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application)

During the current year, has the State made progress in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include—

<b>(1) Early Learning &amp; Development Standards</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Early Learning &amp; Development Standards that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>A Comprehensive Assessment System that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Early Childhood Educator qualifications that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

Developing and Adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS)  
(Continued)

<b>(4) Family engagement strategies</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Family engagement strategies that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(5) Health promotion practices</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Health promotion practices that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(6) Effective data practices</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Effective data practices that currently apply to:</b>	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓



The State has made progress in ensuring that:	
TQRIS Program Standards are measurable	✓
TQRIS Program Standards meaningfully differentiate program quality levels	✓
TQRIS Program Standards reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children	✓
The TQRIS is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs	✓

*Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.*

Michigan is committed to ensuring the integration and use of science-based child development principles and practices, which are linked or highly correlated to program quality in our Great Start to Quality program standards. Prior to the 2011 implementation of GSQ, we worked with the HighScope Educational Research Foundation to conduct a beta test of the standards with 10 early learning and development programs. Programs in the beta test were accredited by NAEYC or the National Association of Family Child Care (NAFCC). The standards were adjusted based on the findings of this test. Michigan adopted the GSQ Program Standards initially in 2011 and reaffirmed them in 2013.

Statewide Alignment – The GSQ standards align with the state's early learning standards (approved by Michigan's State Board of Education), the Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs (ECSQ-IT), and the Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Pre-kindergarten (ECSQ-PK). Our early learning standards are consistent with and meet thresholds of the National Research Council.

Early Learning and Development Standards – The GSQ standards include early learning and development standards that align with, and have been cross-walked to, the ECSQ-PK, ECSQ-IT, Head Start performance standards, and NAEYC accreditation. The GSQ indicators under the Curriculum and Instruction section incorporate the state's early learning and development standards.

Michigan's tiered QRIS is clear and has standards that are measurable, meaningfully differentiate program quality levels, and reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children. The tiered QRIS standards are expressed in terms of levels that correspond to a tiered QRIS rating. The levels are organized by five standards of quality – Curriculum and Instruction, Staff Qualifications and Professional Development, Family and Community Partnerships, Environment, and Administration and Management – with identified indicators of high quality within each category. Our tiered QRIS levels measure a progression of improved program quality. As a part of the GSQ evaluation through RTT-ELC, a validation study of the standards will be conducted. Progress towards this in Year 1 includes convening of a team to develop a request for proposal for the QRS evaluation.

---

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

---

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

In Year 1, two positions, RTT-ELC Project Manager and Quality Improvement Manager, to support Race to the Top activities at the Early Childhood Investment Corporation were filled and training for both positions nearly completed. The RTT-ELC Project Manager oversees all aspects of RTT-ELC projects for ECIC to ensure full implementation and adherence to the reporting criteria and schedule. The Quality Improvement Manager supports activities related to increasing unlicensed, subsidized provider participation and increasing home based provider participation.

A unique feature of Great Start to Quality is the inclusion of unlicensed, subsidized providers in the quality improvement portion of the tiered QRIS. In Michigan, center-based early learning programs and group homes are licensed, home-based providers are registered and individuals who enroll to care for children eligible for child care subsidies are considered unlicensed, subsidized. As with licensed early learning and development programs, unlicensed, subsidized providers are required to participate in a tiered system that encourages unlicensed providers to engage in the quality improvement process. These providers are not rated using the star system, but are rated at Tier 1 through Tier 3. All unlicensed, subsidized providers start at Tier 1 (by completing 7 hours of CPR, health and safety, and child development training). The Tier 1 training must be completed before the unlicensed, subsidized provider becomes eligible to receive the child care subsidy. A RTT-ELC activity designed to increase participation in Great Start to Quality is the development of a cohort model for unlicensed, subsidized providers. This activity will focus on supporting these providers to attain Tier II on the Quality Development Continuum. Development of the Implementation Plan for the unlicensed subsidized provider cohort project was started this year, and all timelines were adjusted to accommodate a shift in the deployment of the subrecipient contract. Contracts for three Great Start to Quality Resource Centers to implement Cohort A were developed and issued by ECIC. Contracts for the three remaining Great Start to Quality Resource Centers will be issued for the implementation of Cohort B in Year 2. A position description for the Quality Improvement Consultant (QIC) positions at the Great Start to Quality Resource Centers was developed and issued to support hiring efforts. The QIC will be responsible for implementing the cohorts at each of the Resource Centers. Resource Centers will be supported to develop the local cohort models with technical assistance from the Quality Improvement Manager. The second group of Resource Centers will launch Cohort B in October of 2015 and will apply learnings from Cohort A for design and implementation. The QICs will be supported in their role with a planned program of training and technical assistance to ensure a base level of knowledge and skill, including adult learning principles, group facilitation, understanding poverty, and continuous quality improvement.

Contracts for five Great Start to Quality Resource Centers to increase participation for family/group home providers in targeted communities were also developed and issued by ECIC. A position description for the Quality Improvement Specialist (QIS) positions at the Great Start to Quality Resource Centers was developed and issued to support hiring efforts. The QIS will conduct outreach to family/group home providers to encourage their participation in Great Start to Quality and provide technical assistance, as needed. A planned program of technical assistance will be established to support the work of the QIS by the Quality Improvement Manager. In addition, a specific marketing campaign will be developed and deployed to target the family/group home provider population.

Another activity designed to increase participation in Great Start to Quality are bonuses to licensed/registered (including home-based) providers for participating in Great Start to Quality. Development of eligibility criteria and an implementation plan for the Participation Bonuses were started this year and will be finalized in Year 2. A marketing campaign will be developed and implemented for this activity to ensure robust participation and will be reviewed annually with adjustments made, as needed. This activity will also be reviewed annually with recommendations for implementation modification considered, as needed. To support the processing of these bonuses, as well as other activities, a position at ECIC was created. A position description for the ECIC Finance Monitor was developed, the position posted and interviews were held this year. A candidate was chosen and will begin in January 2015. Quality Improvement Grants, also designed to increase participation of licensed/registered providers in Great Start to Quality, will be under development during Year 2. Basic planning took place for this activity during this reporting year.

In addition, specific access to the Great Start to Quality STARS platform was created for the Bureau of Children and Adult Licensing (BCAL) licensing consultants. Training modules will be developed to support their understanding of the platform and how they can utilize this resource to support their work. Bi-annual check-in points will be established to review the use of the STARS platform by the licensing consultants.

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

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	580	76.00%	766	100.00%	766	100.00%	766	100.00%	766	100.00%
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	199	35.00%	257	45.00%	314	55.00%	342	60.00%	371	65.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0.00%								
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	8,624	66.70%	9,101	70.46%	9,578	74.16%	10,055	77.85%	10,531	81.54%
Other 1	8,148	100.00%	8,148	100.00%	8,148	100.00%	8,148	100.00%	8,148	100.00%
Describe	Subsidized FFN Providers (Breakout 1 of CCDF Funding)									
Other 2	476	10.00%	953	20.00%	1,430	30.00%	1,907	40.00%	2,383	50.00%
Describe	Licensed Early Learning and Development Programs (Breakout 2 of CCDF Funding)									
Other 3	659	6.00%	1,075	10.00%	3,224	30.00%	4,299	40.00%	5,373	50.00%
Describe	All Licensed Programs Combined Total									

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

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs									
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	766	580	76.00%	764	764	100.00%			
Specify:	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP)								
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	570	199	35.00%	685	399	58.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	56	-	0.00%	56	-	0.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	56	-	0.00%	56	-	0.00%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	630	-	0.00%	630	-	0.00%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	12,915	8,624	66.70%	9,969	7,679	77.00%			
Other 1	8,148	8,148	100.00%	5,706	5,706	100.00%			
Describe:	Subsidized FFN Providers (Breakout 1 of CCDF Funding)								
Other 2	4,767	476	10.00%	4,263	1,973	46.30%			
Describe:	Licensed Early Learning and Development Programs (Breakout 2 of CCDF Funding)								
Other 3	10,747	659	6.00%	10,403	2,076	20.30%			
Describe:	All Licensed Programs Combined Total								

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

Actuals						
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool						
Specify:						
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds						
Other 1						
Describe:						
Other 2						
Describe:						
Other 3						
Describe:						

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

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

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

A licensed or registered program is considered to be participating in Great Start to Quality upon completion and submission of a Self-Assessment Survey and issuance of a published rating. Unlicensed, subsidized providers are considered to be participating upon completion of the required Great Start to Quality Orientation (Tier 1). State-funded preschool (GSRP), Early Head Start and Head Start program fields in Great Start to Quality are self-reported, meaning that the data rely on providers to accurately report their information because there is no mechanism to verify the data.

Number of Early Head Start and Head Start programs reflects the 2013–2014 program year as reported in the Program Information Report (PIR).

Programs receiving funding from IDEA Part B and IDEA Part C, Section 619 are not currently participating in GSQ and are not expected to, as indicated in the check boxes on pp. 13-15. Section 619, Part B and Part C of IDEA numbers are reflective of total grantees (regionally operated by Intermediate School Districts) and not their respective number of total programs or classrooms.

Title I numbers are estimated based on 2010 data of the number of participating children, using an average class size of 18.

Number of unlicensed, subsidized providers reflects the number of active unlicensed, subsidized providers in Michigan as of 9/30/2014. Number of CCDF Licensed Early Learning and Development Programs reflects programs receiving CCDF funding in Fiscal Year 2014, October through August 2014. Data on CCDF provided from the Michigan Department of Human Services Data Warehouse, December 2014 data query.

The "All Licensed Programs Combined Total" refers to the total number of licensed and registered programs (child care centers, group child care homes, and family child care homes) in the state, regardless of if they received CCDF funding.

The number of children represented in this table are not unduplicated, as some children participate in more than one program.

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

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

The Michigan Office of Great Start and Office of Field Services have formed a joint work group to take a look at Title I funding in early childhood, with one goal of improving data tracking in Title I programs.

The "# of programs target" for "Programs receiving funds from CCDF" is lower than expected because there was a decrease in the total number of programs. However, Michigan still exceed its percentage goal for those programs in the TQRIS.

The RTT-ELC key strategies we will implement to reach our targets are:

- Create quality improvement cohorts to increase the quality level of subsidized, unlicensed providers;
- Deploy additional staff support to increase licensed, home-based provider participation;
- Provide financial incentives to increase the number of licensed providers (who care for children receiving a subsidy) participating in GSQ;
- Help licensing consultants become ambassadors for Great Start to Quality;
- Strengthen relationships with Tribal and Early Childhood Special Education (IDEA Part B, Section 619) programs to promote participation in GSQ;
- Create Quality Improvement Grants for subsidized, licensed providers;
- Implement an evaluation of GSQ.

## Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application)

*Has the State made progress during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that:*

System for Rating & Monitoring	
Includes information on valid and reliable tools for monitoring such programs	Yes
Has trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability	Yes
Monitors and rates Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency	Yes
Provides quality rating and licensing information to parents with children enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs (e.g., displaying quality rating information at the program site)	
Makes program quality rating data, information, and licensing history (including any health and safety violations) publicly available in formats that are easy to understand and use for decision making by families selecting Early Learning and Development Programs and families whose children are enrolled in such programs	Yes

*Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs by the end of the grant period.*

Michigan has developed and implemented a system for rating and monitoring the quality of early learning and development programs participating in GSQ that is rigorous, reliable, and accountable to families, policymakers, and funders.

All licensed and registered early learning and development programs that participate in Great Start to Quality beyond the entry point of licensure complete an assessment of quality against the GSQ program standards. Programs with an assessment point total that places them at a 1, 2, or 3 Star level are subject to a twenty-five percent random selection for on-site validation that includes a review of the program's Self-Assessment Survey and uploaded evidence documentation. Once the validation is complete, the program's rating will be published on Great Start to Quality at the validated quality level. For programs with a 1-3 Star rating not selected for validation, the self-assessed rating will be the published rating. Programs with an assessment point total that places them at a 4 or 5 Star level are required to have an on-site validation and a Program Quality Assessment (PQA), after which the program's rating will be published on Great Start to Quality. Program ratings are valid for two years. After two years, the program starts the self-assessment process again and tries to achieve a higher rating. During the six months preceding the expiration of the current rating, programs are notified and encouraged to re-engage in GSQ in order to maintain a published rating. Once the rating expires, programs may still elect to re-engage in GSQ and earn a new published rating. Additionally, programs meeting a specified list of criteria, such as an increase in quality or a change in license capacity or staffing, may apply for a reassessment of their current rating, which may result in the receipt of a new published rating.

To improve the program inspection process, Michigan has begun making progress on identifying key indicators to monitor for compliance. By streamlining compliance monitoring, licensing consultants will have more time to help programs focus on improving their quality outcomes for children. In Year 1, Michigan began work on identifying a contractor that will develop, pilot, and refine the use of key indicators in the licensing process.



**Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application)**

*Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices?*

Policies and Practices Supporting Program Quality	
Program and provider training	Yes
Program and provider technical assistance	Yes
Financial rewards or incentives	Yes
Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates	Yes
Increased compensation	

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
5

*How many programs moved up or down at least one level within the TQRIS over the last fiscal year?*

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level							
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level							

**Optional Notes – State TQRIS Tiers/Levels**

*Explain missing data. If program movement up or down is not tracked by program type in the TQRIS you can provide the Total Programs that Moved Up and Total Programs that Moved Down in this optional notes box.*

Great Start to Quality 2.0 started in June 2013. Sufficient time has not passed to allow for the analysis of movement in quality levels. Program ratings are for a two-year period. At the end of this period, Michigan will be able to compare the program's first rating with their updated rating to determine what improvements have taken place. Therefore, the first re-ratings will start in June 2015.

Has the State made progress in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS in the following areas?

High-Quality Benchmarks at the Highest Level(s) of the TQRIS	
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet State preschool standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or there is a reciprocal agreement between State preschool and the TQRIS)	
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet Federal Head Start Performance Standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, there is a reciprocal agreement between Head Start and the TQRIS, or there is an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet national accreditation standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Early Learning and Development Standards	Yes
A Comprehensive Assessment System	Yes
Early Childhood Educator qualifications	Yes
Family engagement strategies	Yes
Health promotion practices	Yes
Effective data practices	Yes
Program quality assessments	Yes

Please provide more detail on your development of high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS by the end of the grant period.

Michigan's Great Start to Quality standards are based on research-based child development principles and practices, which are highly correlated to program quality. Michigan adopted the GSQ standards in 2011 and reaffirmed them in 2013 by launching GSQ Version 2.0, a truly tiered QRIS informed by experience, research, and data.

**Statewide Alignment** – The GSQ standards align with the state's early learning standards (approved by Michigan's State Board of Education), the Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Infant and Toddler Programs (ECSQ-IT), the Early Childhood Standards of Quality for Pre-kindergarten (ECSQ-PK), Head Start performance standards, and NAEYC accreditation. Our early learning standards are consistent with and meet thresholds of the National Research Council.

**Comprehensive Assessment System** – Developmental screening for children in child care settings and comprehensive formative assessments that address all the developmental domains are linked to the tiered QRIS through the GSQ *Curriculum and Instruction* standard.

**Early Childhood Educator Qualifications** – Michigan's Core Knowledge and Core Competency areas for early childhood educators include academic credentials/degrees achieved, experience, and specific training in early childhood, and are linked to the tiered QRIS through the GSQ standard for *Staff Qualifications and Professional Development*.

**Family Engagement Strategies** – Michigan's family engagement approach is linked to the GSQ system through the *Family and Community Partnerships* standard.

**Health Promotion Practices** – Michigan's health promotion practices are linked to the GSQ system in the *Environment, Curriculum and Instruction, and Family and Community Partnerships* standards.

**Effective Data Practices** – Michigan's effective data practices are linked to the GSQ system through the *Administration and Management* standard.

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

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

### Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	659	1,074	3,224	4,299	5,373	2,076			
Number of Programs in Tier 1	19	107	323	430	537	62			
Number of Programs in Tier 2	36	215	645	860	1,075	133			
Number of Programs in Tier 3	187	268	1,128	1,720	2,149	698			
Number of Programs in Tier 4	397	429	967	1,075	1,343	1,015			
Number of Programs in Tier 5	20	54	161	214	269	168			

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

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

TQRIS data is reflective of January 2, 2015 and collected from the Great Start to Quality STARS platform.

The total number of programs covered by the TQRIS includes licensed/registered providers considered in good standing with the Bureau of Children and Adult Licensing (BCAL). Therefore, licensed/registered providers with a status of "inactive" or "provisional" are not eligible to participate and excluded from the count.

Licensed/registered providers choosing not to participate in GSQ or who are not eligible to participate publicly display with an "Empty Star" and are not included in this count.

For reference, at the time of application, 10,747 licensed/registered programs were eligible to participate in GSQ, by definition, but have not applied to receive a rating. This was the baseline originally submitted for "Total Number of Programs Covered by TQRIS," but did not accurately reflect the total number of programs with a rating in GSQ in 2013, so has now been updated to reflect that distinction (659 programs). As of January 2, 2015, 9,464 licensed/registered providers were considered eligible to participate in GSQ. 2,076 programs had a rating of 1-Star to 5-Stars in Great Start to Quality.

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

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

Performance targets were met due largely in part to successfully implementing mandatory GSQ participation, with a minimal Tier 3 rating, for state-funded preschool (Great Start Readiness Program) providers and their community-based partners.

Currently, Michigan is unable to track tier movement up and down for programs. Data to track tier movement up and down for programs is available, however current reporting capabilities are limited and not easily producible. Enhancements to the data system are planned to allow this data to be tracked more easily and reported upon as needed. These enhancements will be implemented by the end of 2015. Specifications outlining exact parameters for reporting have not yet been developed with the data system contractor.

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

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	24,426	51.00%	48,075	100.00%	48,075	100.00%	48,075	100.00%	48,075	100.00%
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	13,060	35.00%	16,791	45.00%	20,522	55.00%	22,388	60.00%	24,253	65.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	0.00%	227	2.00%	227	2.00%	453	4.00%	453	4.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	-	0.00%	2,722	10.00%	8,164	30.00%	10,886	40.00%	13,607	50.00%

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

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	48,075	24,426	51.00%	30,517	30,517	100.00%			
Specify:	Great Start Readiness Programs (GSRP)								
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	37,313	13,060	35.00%	41,310	22,545	54.60%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%	12,028	-	0.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	-	0.00%	19,987	-	0.00%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	11,332	-	0.00%	8,440	-	0.00%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	27,215	-	0.00%	23,635	8,458	35.80%			

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

Actuals						
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool						
Specify:						
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds						

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

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

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

Michigan considers the top tiers of its TQRIS to be programs rated 3-stars or higher.

State-funded preschool: The Great Start Readiness Program numbers are based on funded enrollment from 2014. All GSRP programs are required to be 3 Stars or higher.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Federal Office of Head Start Program Information Report, reporting year 2013-14. Estimate of children enrolled in the top tiers of the TQRIS is based on the total number of slots in 3 Star or higher programs.

IDEA, Part C and IDEA Part B, Section 619 Programs: Programs serving these children are not yet licensed. As these programs become licensed or we identify alternate paths for participation in GSQ, these programs may eventually be included. The 56 "programs" number is representative of the total number of Intermediate School Districts in the state.

Programs funded under Title I: Data currently not available on the number of children in Title I programs, disaggregated by star rating.

Programs receiving funds from CCDF: Michigan Department of Human Services Data Warehouse, December 2014 query

The number of children represented in this table are not unduplicated as some children participate in more than one program.

Total number of children in programs pulled from the same sources as Table (A)(1)(5).

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

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

We do not yet have a mechanism for tracking the number and percentage of programs funded under Title I of ESEA who participate in Great Start to Quality and/or the number of children who participate in these programs. The Office of Great Start and Office of Field Services have formed a committee to explore solutions around how to track early childhood education and care funded by Title I.

Over the past several years, CCDF caseloads have been declining for a variety of reasons, including an increase in the unemployment rate; stagnant eligibility; budget reductions; children relocating out of state with their parents; change to other assistance program eligibility requirements; and integrity efforts.

---

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

---

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

Michigan has begun the process of identifying a contractor to evaluate the effectiveness of the Great Start to Quality System. To best determine the effectiveness of the GSQ system, Michigan has decided to focus on the following research questions:

1. How effectively do the Great Start to Quality rating levels differentiate the quality level of programs?
2. How effectively does the Great Start to Quality system ensure all children are developmentally ready to succeed at the time of school entry and ensure children with high needs receive high-quality care?
3. What are the specific local, regional, and state conditions that promote the effective implementation of Great Start to Quality and the growth of higher quality early childhood programs throughout the state?

A Request for Proposals (RFP) has been written and is currently in the internal review process before going out for bid. The RFP calls for a multi-year, mixed-methods evaluation that will measure how the GSQ system reflects the nuanced differential levels of program quality and assesses how changes in ratings are related to progress in child outcomes. The evaluation design includes secondary and primary data collection involving both the population of programs targeted by Great Start to Quality and a stratified sample, targeting early learning and development home-based providers and center-based programs, including Head Start, GSRP, and Title 1 programs serving children in targeted communities.

Additionally, the evaluation design includes: assessment of early childhood program readiness to participate in GSQ and readiness of the state to implement it; longitudinal assessment of child development, learning, and school readiness relative to program quality; the use of GIS mapping to better understand the intersection of geographic location, demographics (diversity characteristics, poverty rates, etc.), as they relate both to successful GSQ implementation and to children's outcomes, and an examination of program, local, and regional characteristics that are associated with effective Great Start to Quality implementation and growth in program quality across the state.



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

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

### Focused Investment Areas

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

## Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

---

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

---

*Has the State made progress in:*

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

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

Michigan plans to assist families and providers of early learning and care in supporting the healthy development and well-being of children with high needs. Michigan will accomplish this goal by building on efforts already underway across the state to increase healthy behaviors through education and personal action. Through RTT-ELC, these efforts will increase the availability of high-quality early learning programs that meet the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children, with a focus on Pathways to Potential communities.

Michigan's goal for this RTT-ELC reform area is to help create an early learning and development system that supports the physical and social-emotional development of children from birth to 8 years of age.

The specific strategies and related outcomes associated with this goal include:

- Align Great Start to Quality program standards with nationally recognized physical and social-emotional health standards;
- Develop training and technical assistance materials and supports that promote healthy habits for families and providers, including materials about developmental screening and referral procedures;
- Provide consultants to support home-based providers in meeting the physical and social-emotional health needs of young children.

The progress made toward these efforts in Year 1 include:

- Collaborative meetings between MDE and DCH staff to update and improve project plans, review draft interagency agreements, and review sub-recipient monitoring plans and requirements. Based on these meetings, resources and staffing have been realigned to meet project expectations. Position descriptions were drafted in Year 1 and will be moved forward in Year 2 to assure measurable progress.

- In the original application, the state indicated an intent to set targets related to number of referrals made following a developmental screening. The state has not yet developed a methodology to collect data about referrals, and is still working to establish a means to respond to this metric. Further, our Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV) benchmark reporting has identified that counting referrals is not a meaningful way to track activity post-screening, because many different types of activity could occur other than a referral, and the alternate activities may be more meaningful, or more acceptable, to a family that is not interested in a referral. We are participating in the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) MIECHV Home Visiting Collaborative Improvement and Innovation Network (CoIIN) project, with two local home visiting sites working on the topic of Developmental Screening and Surveillance, which addresses ways to improve follow up. We will continue to learn from this CoIIN work, and be able to share more about what we learn and potential next steps toward the end of Year 2 of the RTT-ELC grant.

## Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

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

### Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.

	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Number of Children with High Needs screened	14,400	18,113	21,736	25,358	28,981	14,400	56,763		
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment									
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	166,373					166,373	165,214		
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	166,373					166,373	165,214		

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

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

Number of Children with High Needs Screened: represents Fee for Service claims and managed care encounter data for billing codes 96110 and 96111 for 0-3 year olds and for 0-5 year olds enrolled in Medicaid. Source: Michigan Department of Community Health Data Warehouse

Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment: MDCH is working to build a query for the Data Warehouse to obtain this data.

Number of Children with High Needs who participate in on-going health care and number/percentage of those who are up-to-date: represent Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS) measures for 1) Well-Visits First 15 Months of Life, Six or More Visits, and 2) 3rd-6th Years of Life annual visits. Source: MDCH Data Warehouse

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

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

Michigan has invested significantly in the promotion and implementation of screening and referral procedures under Medicaid's Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) program. The state's Medicaid program has "unbundled" the billing for developmental screening, and distributed policy and information about billing to primary care providers. The Promoting Child Development Screening II Project trains physicians and their office staff to integrate regular developmental and social-emotional screenings into their daily work flow.

Updated EPSDT guidance from the MDCH Medical Services Administration affirms the critical role of primary health care providers in conducting screenings in accordance with the periodicity schedule provided through Bright Futures, and making referrals to other health and/or community providers for follow-up services. Bright Futures is a national health promotion initiative dedicated to the principle that every child deserves to be healthy and that optimal health involves a trusting relationship between the health professional, the child, the family, and the community as partners in health practice. Through RTT-ELC, Michigan plans to use Specialized Health Consultants to support home-based providers in promoting screening, referral, and well-child care for the children and families with which they work. The Specialized Health Consultant will support providers who might be struggling to meet the quality indicators related to health and increase their ability to (1) engage families in conversations about seeking and using health care, especially well-child visits, (2) support families to follow up on any community-based referrals, and (3) help families understand where they can find information about and access health insurance and health care. Over the next four years of the grant, Michigan will also develop screening, referral, and well-child care training and train home-based providers so they can more fully support children and families. Although progress on these initiatives has been hampered by delays in finalization of interagency agreements and staffing, MDCH administration are poised and anxious to begin work in Year 2.

The data presented represents Medicaid billing claims that have been submitted for developmental screening activities in primary care provider offices. We believe that the advent of a HEDIS measure related to developmental screening is likely impacting the significant gains in this metric, along with some impact of efforts under our Project Linking Actions for Unmet Needs in Children's Health (LAUNCH) grant to promote more developmental screening in primary care provider offices in Federally Qualified Health Centers.

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

*Has the State made progress in:*

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

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

Supporting the critical role that families play in their children's early learning and development is a key recommendation in Michigan's plan for early learning and development. "Great Start, Great Investment, Great Future" also includes a set of guiding principles, including "families and communities must have a voice in building and operating the system." Michigan also supports parent coalitions as a part of our local early childhood system governance structure. These Great Start Parent Coalitions (GSPCs) are convened by families and are dedicated to bringing family voice into local decision-making and public education/public will activities. Additionally, all Great Start Collaboratives (GSCs) include parents of young children as 20 percent of their membership. This governance body for the local early childhood system helps to ensure that all children in the community meet the prenatal to age 8 outcomes. To further build on this approach to authentically engaging families and supporting their development as leaders for their own children and communities, Michigan is utilizing the following strategies through RTT-ELC:

- Assure GSQ standards for Family and Community Partnership engagement reflect the Strengthening Families™ Protective Factors (SFPPF) framework;
- Enhance the quality improvement capacity of GSQ through the addition of specialized Quality Improvement Consultants (QICs) in family engagement;
- Use specialized quality improvement consultation to measurably improve the capacity of home-based providers to engage families in their children's learning;
- Ensure that families have information and resources that support their engagement in children's learning and development;
- Engage Great Start Parent Coalitions to strengthen their community of trusted advisors to improve linkages to the families most difficult to engage in early learning and development programs and related community supports.

In Year 1, a position description was developed within MDE for a family engagement specialist to lead these initiatives. Hiring and onboarding for this position is scheduled to occur early in Year 2.

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

### Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application)

*Has the State made progress in improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs with the goal of improving child outcomes:*

Supporting Early Childhood Educators	
Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework	
Implementing policies and incentives that promote professional and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention, including:	Yes
<i>Scholarships</i>	Yes
<i>Compensation and wage supplements</i>	
<i>Tiered reimbursement rates</i>	Yes
<i>Other financial incentives</i>	
<i>Management opportunities</i>	
Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention	
Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for:	Yes
<i>Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework</i>	Yes
<i>Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework</i>	Yes

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

Michigan State Board of Education approved revised Core Knowledge and Core Competencies (CKCC) for the Early Care and Education Workforce in November of 2014. Therefore, the number of institutions aligned with the newly revised CKCCs is less than the baseline data reported in Michigan's Race to the Top application. The revised CKCCs are aligned with the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards, so the number of institutions that are NAEYC accredited currently is 7. Michigan has a project to increase the number of institutions that are NAEYC accredited as part of RTT-ELC and will continue to support other Institutions of Higher Education to align with the revised CKCCs.

## Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1)

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

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

	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	27	28	30	31	32	7			
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	759	789	849	909	969	154			

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

Michigan State Board of Education approved revised CKCC's in November of 2014. Because the new CKCCs were just approved in November, the number of institutions aligned is less than the baseline data. Since the revised CKCCs are aligned with the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards, the data reflected in this section is the number of institutions that are NAEYC accredited. The data for the number of graduates from aligned institutions was obtained from the Michigan Community College Network for 2013-2014 by CIP codes: 13.1210, 19.0708, and 19.0709.

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

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

The specific RTT-ELC strategies and related outcomes associated with these targets include:

- Expand online Child Development Associate (CDA) credential programs for early childhood educators;
- Increase the number of National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accredited community college early learning programs;
- Expand opportunities for home-based providers to earn a degree, as well as increase the supply of staff qualified to teach in Michigan's Great Start Readiness Program, through Teacher Education And Compensation Helps (T.E.A.C.H.) scholarships;
- Increase access to training focused on achieving Great Start to Quality standards for program administration.



The progress made toward these efforts in Year 1 include:

- Hiring and training of qualified MIAEYC staff to support RTT-ELC project work;
- Provision of 66 T.E.A.C.H. scholarships to eligible providers for fall 2014 semester, including 41 scholarships to home-based providers and 25 scholarships to providers seeking certification to teach in GSRP.

## Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2)

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

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

Targets											
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year										
Progression: High to Low / Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Credential Type 1	383		414		445		476		507		
Specify:	CDA										
Credential Type 2	827		858		889		920		951		
Specify:	AA										
Credential Type 3	1,141		1,142		1,143		1,155		1,168		
Specify:	BA										
Credential Type 4	920	93.40%	1,212	72.80%	1,582	95.00%	1,582	95.00%	1,582	95.00%	
Specify:	ZS/ZA Endorsement (GSRP only)										

Actuals											
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year										
Progression: High to Low / Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Credential Type 1	383										
Specify:	CDA										
Credential Type 2	827										
Specify:	AA										
Credential Type 3	1,141										
Specify:	BA										
Credential Type 4	920	93.40%									
Specify:	ZS/ZA Endorsement (GSRP only)										

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

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

The previous data source for this performance measure utilized provider self-reported educational attainment data from Great Start CONNECT. This database was recently absorbed by Great Start to Quality with no

continued collection of self-reported educational attainment data for home-based providers not participating in GSQ. Plans for a replacement collection method for this data include capturing this data through the professional development registry currently under development. Michigan is working on identifying a solution to collect and report this data more comprehensively moving forward.

The ZA/ZS endorsement is an early childhood endorsement in the State of Michigan for educators teaching children ages birth to eight, and includes content on teaching young children with special needs.

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

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

## Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

*Has the State made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that:*

Kindergarten Entry Assessment	
Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness	Yes
Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities	Yes
Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the third year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten (e.g., the 2014-2015 school year for Round 1 grantee states, the 2015-2016 school year for Round 2 grantees). States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation	Yes
Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws	Yes
Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA)	Yes

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

Michigan's Kindergarten Entry Assessment is aligned with its Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all essential domains of school readiness. The assessment is currently conducted by Teaching Strategies GOLD, and reports on the following domains: social-emotional, physical, language and literacy, approaches toward learning, and mathematics. The Teaching Strategies GOLD assessment has been reviewed by independent researchers at the Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation at the University of North Carolina, who found that it is a reliable and valid measure of child growth and development. Teachers are required to pass an inter-rater reliability training module prior to administering the assessment. The KEA is administered in the fall of the kindergarten year.

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

The Kindergarten Entry Assessment is continuing to be rolled out in Michigan classrooms. A field test and pilot of TS Gold was completed in fall 2013 and fall 2014, respectively. An evaluation of Michigan's KEA model within the context of a PK-3 assessment continuum is currently underway, with tentative plans for targeted expansion in fall 2015.

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

*Has the State made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that:*

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

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

Michigan has made important progress in setting the groundwork for building out the state's early learning data system that captures child-level data, early childhood educator data, and program-level data for early learning programs. In Year 1, Michigan began convening the Head Start Data Advisory Committee, with representation from the Michigan Department of Education, the Center for Performance and Educational Information (CEPI), and Head Start grantees. The advisory group designed the Unique Identification Code (UIC) pilot, which will begin implementation in spring 2015. CEPI, with the recommendations from the advisory board, has begun addressing the strategic questions needed to move forward with integrating state level data with Head Start data.

Michigan continues to build on and enhance its early childhood data system and additional progress includes:

- A contract mechanism established by CEPI to obtain the needed information to develop aggregate reports on early childhood programs in a timely and accurate manner;
- The Michigan Department of Human Services and CEPI have begun drafting a data sharing agreement that would allow information between education and child care data systems; and
- Work to ensure all data collection and reporting complies with all State and Federal laws concerning privacy and security of student data.

## Data Tables

### Commitment to early learning and development

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income <sup>1</sup> 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	38,159	36%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	92,970	38%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	147,454	47%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	278,583	42%

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

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

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

#### Data Sources:

U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey & State Center for Health Statistics, MI, Annual Social and Economic Supplements (CPS ASEC) estimates for 2013; 2014 CPS ASEC estimates are not yet available, and therefore 2013 estimates were used for 2014 data. Available at:

<http://www.census.gov/cps/data/cpstablecreator.html>.

Note: The total number of children ages 0-5 in Michigan in 2013 was estimated at 659,384.

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, State Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, 2010 -2013. Released June 2014.

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

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs		
Special Populations: Children who...	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays <sup>1</sup>	25,004	3.6%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	60,004	9.1%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	2,609	0.4%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	7,718	1.1%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	8,123	1.2%
Are in foster care	5,702	0.9%
Other 1 as identified by the State	166,824	25.3%
Describe:	Children at 100% of Poverty or below, 0-5 years old, Rural (Not in a MSA)	
Other 2 as identified by the State	111,436	16.9%
Describe:	Children at 100% of Poverty or below, 0-5 years old, Urban (Not in a MSA)	
<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP). <sup>2</sup> For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English. <sup>3</sup> For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2). <sup>4</sup> The term "homeless children" has the meaning given the term "homeless children and youths" in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).		

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

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Have disabilities or developmental delays: Michigan Department of Education, 2013. Special Education count. Retrieved from <http://www.datacenter.kidscount.org>.

Are English Learners: U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey 2009-2013 estimates. Retrieved from [http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml)

Resides on Indian Lands: U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey 2007-11 estimates.

Are migrant: Michigan Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Enumeration Profiles Study, 2013 (most recent data available). Retrieved from [http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dhs/FarmworkerReport\\_430130\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dhs/FarmworkerReport_430130_7.pdf)

Are homeless: Michigan Statewide Homeless Management Information System, 2013 data. Retrieved from [http://michigan.gov/documents/mshda/MCTEH\\_Synopsis\\_2013\\_475407\\_7.pdf](http://michigan.gov/documents/mshda/MCTEH_Synopsis_2013_475407_7.pdf)

Are in foster care: Michigan Department of Human Services, In Care Counts by County Age 0-5 (Project #9304)

Children at 100% of poverty or below, 0-5 years old, Rural and Urban: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 American Community Survey (Table GCT1702)

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

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

<b>Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning &amp; Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	-	-	27,250	27,250
Specify:	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP)			
Data Source and Year:	GSRP History of Funding 2013-14 program year (funded enrollment)			
<b>Early Head Start &amp; Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	1,556	4,636	35,118	41,310
Data Source and Year:	Program Information Report (PIR) Cumulative Enrollment for 2012-2013 Reporting year (Cumulative enrollment, not funded)			
<b>Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	1,000	8,987	19,731	29,718
Data Source and Year:	Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	1,328	-	7,112	8,440
Data Source and Year:	Consolidated State Performance Report: Parts 1 and 2 for School Year 2012-13			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	3,436	8,815	11,384	23,635
Data Source and Year:	Michigan Department of Human Services Data Warehouse, December 2014 Query			
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.				

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

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

"Infants under age 1" count for "Programs Funded Under Title I of ESEA" represents children ages 0-2.

Data sources and year are included in the table.



Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Hispanic Children	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	2,742	143	485	6,963	47	1,131	15,739
Specify:	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP)						
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	5,199	1,298	571	15,288	35	3,768	19,391
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	764	100	185	2,064	9	293	8,613
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,237	133	378	2,689	23	538	13,431
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	3,538	349	814	5,208	37	1,144	28,117
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	1,147	147	63	11,534	5	8	9,874

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

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

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

State funded preschool: Retrieved from Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)

Early Head Start and Head Start: Program Information Report (PIR) Cumulative Enrollment for 2013-14 reporting year.

Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA Part B: Retrieved from Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)

Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA Part C, Section 619: Retrieved from Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)

Early Learning and Development Programs funder under Title I of ESEA: Educational Entity Master (EEM) and the 2012-2013 CEPI pupil headcount reports

Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program: Michigan Department of Human Services Data Warehouse, December 2014 query. Note: CCDF reporting also includes an "Other/non-categorized" race, which was reported at 862 children.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<b>Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start &amp; Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	\$691,262	\$791,570			
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$109,275,000	\$174,275,000			
Specify:	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP)				
<b>State contributions to IDEA, Part C</b>					
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry</b>	\$19,767,784	\$20,431,354			
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$51,123,693	\$45,227,916			
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Exceeded	Not Met			
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>	\$1,005,842				
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>					
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>					
Specify:	Great Parents, Great Start (parenting information and education program birth to kindergarten entry)				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	\$6,703,915	\$6,449,747			
Specify:	State reimbursements for special education programs and services under rule 340.1755				
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>	\$1,557,221				
Specify:	Section 31a of State School Aid Act: At Risk Early Childhood Instructional Services				
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>	\$15,775,971				
Specify:	Medicaid School Based Services (SBS)				
<b>Other State contributions 5</b>	\$17,652,969	\$3,194,711			
Specify:	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV)				
<b>Other State contributions 6</b>	\$12,500,000	\$12,500,000			
Specify:	Office of Great Start Supplemental funds				
<b>Other State contributions 7</b>	\$10,900,000	\$10,900,000			
Specify:	Early Childhood Block Grant				
<b>Total State contributions:</b>					

<sup>1</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.  
<sup>2</sup> Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.  
<sup>3</sup> Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

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

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

Note: Michigan's fiscal year ends on September 30th.

Supplemental Funding Early Head Start and Head Start: Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (Title V) funding supporting Head Start and Early Head Start. Data provided by the Michigan Department of Community Health.

State-funded preschool: Great Start Readiness Program - GSRP History of Funding 2013-14

State Contributions to IDEA Part C: See state reimbursements for programs for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages birth to age three under rule 340.1755.

State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry: Office of Special Education calculation for programs under Michigan Administrative Rule 340.1754.

Total State contributions to CCDF and State match to CCDF: ACF-696 4th Quarter Report. The state's contributions to CCDF dropped in Michigan because funding is appropriated through a caseload consensus process. Funds are appropriated to cover the cost of cases. As our cases have decreased so has our funding appropriation, which means not all of our federal funding is appropriated each year. State General Fund contribution is based on the appropriated amount, not the federal award amount.

TANF Spending on Early Learning and Development Programs: Michigan does not directly appropriate TANF funding to directly support the care of children.

State reimbursements for programs for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages birth to age three under rule 340.1755: Office of Special Education calculation for programs under Michigan Administrative Rule 340.1755. Special education expenses are driven by the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) for each child/student, and thus fluctuates from year-to-year dependent on the number of children receiving services, as well as the intensity and duration of the delivery of the services written on the IEP.

Great Parents, Great Start: Originally appropriated under State School Aid Act section 32j, Great Parents, Great Start funds were collapsed into the Early Childhood Block Grant in 2012. Great Parents, Great Start is a parent involvement and education program for families with children from ages birth to kindergarten entry.

Section 31a of State School Aid Act: At Risk Early Childhood Instructional Services: Data for 2014 is not yet available. 2013 is an estimate based on programs receiving funding from 31a.

Medicaid School Based Services (SBS): Program helps defray some of the costs of health care and related services delivered to students under IDEA Part B and C. Historical funding provided by the Michigan Department of Community Health, latest data available is for 2013. Data for calendar year 2014 is not yet available.

Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV): MIECHV funding, based on federal awards made to Michigan for the federal grant year. (This does not represent how much funding we have to spend during a particular spending period, only new federal awards that were made during the time frame). FY2013 is the most recent data available. Data provided by the Michigan Department of Community Health. The figure reported regarding the MIECHV does not represent the state contribution to MIEHCV, it represents the

amount of the federal MIECHV award to Michigan in the specific reporting year. In FY2013, the state received a large 3-year MIECHV Competitive grant plus the annual Formula grant; in FY2014, only the Formula grant was received. The federal MIECHV awards are included in this chart because they, in turn, contribute to the overall effort in the state to implement a comprehensive early childhood system e.g., home visiting - regardless of fund source - is a resource that contributes to the comprehensive early childhood system.

Office of Great Start Supplemental Funds: Funds for the development of a kindergarten entry status assessment and implementation of Great Start to Quality were appropriated in P.A. 29 of 2012. Available through 9/30/2015.

Early Childhood Block Grant: Funds are appropriated under section 32p of the State School Aid Act.

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

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

<b>Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b> <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	32,139	27,250	
Specify:	Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) (funded enrollment)		
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	37,313	41,310	
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	30,289	29,718	
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b> <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report )</i>	11,677	8,440	
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> <i>(average monthly served)</i>	27,215	23,635	
<b>Other 1</b>	8,458	-	
Describe:	Great Parents, Great Start (GPGS)		
<b>Other 2</b>	1,584	1,296	
Describe:	Section 31a of State School Aid Act: At Risk Early Childhood Instructional Services		
<sup>1</sup> Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.			
<sup>2</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.			

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

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

Early Head Start and Head Start: Program Information Report for 2014.

Programs and Services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, Section 619: Retrieved from the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)

Programs funded under Title I under ESEA: Consolidated State Performance Report: Parts 1 and 2 for School Year 2012-13

Programs receiving CCDF funds: Michigan Department of Human Services Data Warehouse, December 2014 query. Over the past several years, CCDF caseloads have been declining for a variety of reasons, including an

increase in the unemployment rate; stagnant eligibility; budget reductions; children relocating out of state with their parents; change to other assistance program eligibility requirements; and integrity efforts.

Great Parents, Great Start: Program funding folded into the Early Childhood Block Grant

Section 31a of State School Aid Act: At Risk - Early Childhood Instructional Services: Estimate based on an average class size of 18 and number of programs enrolled, function code 118.

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

Check marks indicate the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards			
Essential Domains of School Readiness	Age Groups		
	Infants	Toddlers	Preschoolers
Language and literacy development	✓	✓	✓
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)	✓	✓	✓
Approaches toward learning	✓	✓	✓
Physical well-being and motor development	✓	✓	✓
Social and emotional development	✓	✓	✓

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



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

Check marks indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State					
Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Specify:					
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	✓	✓			✓
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619		✓	✓	✓	✓
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Programs receiving CCDF funds	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tier 1					
Tier 2	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tier 3	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tier 4	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tier 5	✓	✓	✓	✓	
State licensing requirements	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Other 1	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Describe:	Great Parents, Great Start (GSGS)				
<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

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

## Budget and Expenditure Tables

### Budget and Expenditure Table 1: Overall Budget and Expenditure Summary by Budget Category

Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous budget period and for the current reporting period.

#### Budget Summary Table

Budget Summary Table					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$108,559.70	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$108,559.70
2. Fringe Benefits	\$65,169.92	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$65,169.92
3. Travel	\$2,837.04	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,837.04
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$5,896.86	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,896.86
6. Contractual	\$121,059.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$121,059.25
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$4,528.59	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,528.59
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$308,051.36	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$308,051.36
10. Indirect Costs	\$20,946.04	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,946.04
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$21,911.86	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21,911.86
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$15,649.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,649.08
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)</b>	<b>\$366,558.34</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$366,558.34</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)</b>	<b>\$366,558.34</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$366,558.34</b>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Budget Summary Table Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

In 2014, Michigan spent 42% or \$366,558.34 of the allocated funding within the Year One budget. The total budget available in Year One and associated spending was reflective of the planning and capacity building efforts that consumed much of this grant period. As part of the federal approval process, Michigan underwent budget revisions in the last quarter of Year One which included modifications to the Year One budget to better reflect activities.

The following items have contributed to under spending the total Year One allocation:

- Across the Year One project budgets, there was a total of \$60,989.30 in unspent staffing funds due to longer than anticipated timelines for development of agreements, budget and scope of work development, and staff hiring and on-boarding processes;
- Fringe benefit costs were also less than anticipated with \$53,692.08 in savings. This cost reduction can be attributed to actual benefits coming in under projections as positions were hired, as well as delayed hiring, or hiring moved into 2015 that was originally budgeted in 2014;
- Given the delay in agreements and staffing, budgeted travel was underspent by \$10,962.96. Future years will rely more heavily on travel funds, especially given the need to engage stakeholders statewide in a geographically diverse state;
- Supplies funding was underspent by \$17,653.14 due to delays in staff hiring;
- Equipment and Training Stipends were both budgeted for \$0, and \$0 were spent;
- Contractual costs were underspent by \$252,913.75 because it took longer than anticipated to enact interagency agreements and contracts with partner organizations/agencies to establish a mechanism for payment.

Michigan plans to distribute Year 1 unspent funds from travel, equipment, supplies, training stipends, and other lines into Year 2.

### **Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 1 budget rollover will be added to the year 2 budget, to support the payment for program work that was delayed into year 2.

## Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Management and Governance

Budget Table: Project 1					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$80,753.88	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$80,753.88</b>
2. Fringe Benefits	\$57,871.43	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$57,871.43</b>
3. Travel	\$1,526.72	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$1,526.72</b>
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
5. Supplies	\$5,638.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$5,638.78</b>
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
8. Other	\$4,232.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$4,232.00</b>
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$150,022.81	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$150,022.81</b>
10. Indirect Costs	\$13,572.72	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$13,572.72</b>
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$21,911.86	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$21,911.86</b>
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$15,649.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$15,649.08</b>
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>\$201,156.47</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$201,156.47</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$201,156.47</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$201,156.47</b>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Project 1 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

During year 1, there was a delay in hiring qualified staff to manage the grant. Due to this delay, expenditures in personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment and indirect costs were lower than estimated.

**Project 1 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 1 budget rollover will be added to the year 2 budget, to support the payment for program work that was delayed into year 2.

**Budget Table: Project 2 – Improving Quality through Increased Participation in Great Start to Quality**

<b>Budget Table: Project 2</b>					
<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$22,748.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$22,748.25</b>
2. Fringe Benefits	\$6,065.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$6,065.27</b>
3. Travel	\$1,310.32	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$1,310.32</b>
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
5. Supplies	\$258.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$258.08</b>
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
8. Other	\$296.59	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$296.59</b>
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$30,678.51	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$30,678.51</b>
10. Indirect Costs	\$4,601.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$4,601.78</b>
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>\$35,280.29</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$35,280.29</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$35,280.29</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$35,280.29</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 2 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

During Year 1, it took longer than anticipated to enact interagency agreements and contracts with partner organizations/agencies to establish a mechanism for payment. Therefore, hiring of staff and related work were delayed. Due to this delay, expenditures in personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment and indirect costs were lower than estimated.

**Project 2 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 1 budget rollover will be added to the year 2 budget, to support the payment for program work that was delayed into year 2.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Promotion of Physical and Social-Emotional Health

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



**Project 3 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

No funds were spent of the \$2,030 budgeted for Project 3 because an interagency agreement and funding mechanism was still being finalized between the Michigan Departments of Education and Community Health.

**Project 3 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 1 budget rollover will be added to the year 2 budget, to support the payment for program work that was delayed into year 2.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Enhancing Great Start to Quality System

Budget Table: Project 4					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$2,179.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,179.34
2. Fringe Benefits				\$308.32	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$2,487.66	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,487.66
10. Indirect Costs	\$373.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$373.16
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$2,860.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,860.82
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$2,860.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,860.82

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 4 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Project 4 expenditures were lower than budgeted for Personnel and Fringe Benefits during Year 1 because there was a delay in hiring qualified staff.

**Project 4 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 1 budget rollover will be added to the year 2 budget, to support the payment for program work that was delayed into year 2.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Improving the Early Learning Child Care Workforce

Budget Table: Project 5					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$120,675.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$120,675.38
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$120,675.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$120,675.38
10. Indirect Costs	\$1,825.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,825.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$122,500.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$122,500.38
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$122,500.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$122,500.38

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 5 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Contractual expenditures were less than originally expected because the majority of funds were spent in December, but were not reimbursed until Year 2. As such, those expenditures do not appear in Michigan's Year 1 Budget Summary. Indirect costs were not budgeted in Year 1, but the negative balance has been moved into Year 2 and will not significantly affect the overall budget.

**Project 5 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 1 budget rollover will be added to the year 2 budget, to support the payment for program work and billing that was delayed into year 2.

Budget Table: Project 6 – Measuring Outcomes for Children, Programs, & Educators

Budget Table: Project 6					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$2,878.23	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,878.23
2. Fringe Benefits				\$924.90	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$383.87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$383.87
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$4,187.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,187.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$573.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$573.38
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$4,760.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,760.38
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$4,760.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,760.38

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 6 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

Funds in Personnel and Fringe Benefits were underspent due to delays in hiring qualified staff and finalizing an interagency agreement between the Michigan Department of Education and the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI)/Department of Technology, Management, and Budget. Funds that were spent in Year 1 by CEPI will be reimbursed in Year 2 of the project.

**Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for year 2. The year 1 budget rollover will be added to the year 2 budget, to support the payment for program work and billing that was delayed into year 2.

**Budget Table: Project 7 – Increasing Family Engagement**

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

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.  
 Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.  
 Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.  
 Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.  
 Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.  
 Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.  
 Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.  
 Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.



**Project 7 Budget Narrative**

*Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.*

No funds were budgeted or spent on project 7 in Year 1.

**Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

We do not anticipate substantive changes in our budget for Year 2.