



U.S. Department of Health & Human Services

ADMINISTRATION FOR
CHILDREN & FAMILIES

Office of Child Care



Update on the Progress of the State Advisory Council

January 23, 2013

Webinar Transcript

Note: The first 5 minutes of Linda Smith's introduction were not recorded due to technical issues.

Linda Smith: ... a lot more funding in the field. We also weren't sure what we were buying for the money that we already had and he wanted to put into place a mechanism that would get the States working together to better coordinate existing funds so we would know where we needed to go in the future with funding and how we could begin to close the gap. So really it's one of his early visions, and as we all know the Early Care and Education Act didn't pass, but in the years that followed that—and Roberto Rodríguez, who is now in the White House Domestic Policy Council, was also very committed to those State Advisory Councils still working for Senator Kennedy and they worked to get them authorized in the Head Start Reauthorization Act.

So it's kind of the history of how they came to be, and I think sometimes we sort of focus on well, they're in the Head Start Reauthorization Act, they're more about Head Start than anything. In actuality they were originally conceived to be a much broader comprehensive rule that could really take on some of the issues in the State and begin to think about how we raise the funding and how we are smarter about the use of Federal resources. So what we're hoping to do today is go through some of what's happened over the last year since the Councils were put into place and then the funding went out with the ARRA funds. So with that, I want to just say that we have many States that have given us input and lots of things are going on with these Councils, and I felt like we had a real need to let people know what was going on with the Councils and the successes that they've had.

On the call today we're going to have three States present on what has been going on in their State: Texas, New York and Oregon, but we know that there are many other Councils out there who are doing marvelous things and really just the types of activities that were originally envisioned when Senator Kennedy had that first thought about that Bill. So what we are going to be doing here real soon is issuing a report on the activities of the State Advisory Councils to sort of promote and let people know what's going on with this initiative since the funding went out.

Many of the things have been just very targeted at exactly the types of things that we wanted to see happen with them; with data collection, with professional development, with a host of activities that really lead us to the kinds of coordination we wanted to see in the States. So I think what I want to do before we go on to finally remind everyone, we do know that the ARRA funding is running out soon, I

want to put a special plug in every time I talk to anyone about State Advisory Councils. I want to urge you to make sure that you are executing your funds as need be, because we are getting to the end of the grant period and we do need to make sure that these funds get executed. And we are not at a place where we think we should be yet with that, with it being at about 40 percent execution right now. We've got a ways to go. We know that there are processes to getting these things in, but at the end of the day the execution is going to be very important to any continuation of work on State Advisory Councils. And with that said, I just want to remind people that there is a 70 percent State match so we want to acknowledge all that the States have put in to the State Advisory Councils to make them happen.

Certainly the ARRA funding was the seed money to get it going, but at the end of the day it's the State money that will keep it going, and the State's interest and energy around this kind of coordinating work that will keep it going. So I want to encourage everyone on this hall to continue to think about this, help us think about it, and how lessons learned, how we can help other States, and as we move forward what are the opportunities to move State Advisory Councils to yet another level. So with that being said, I'm going to turn it over to Ngozi who is going to go through the overview of what we have. As she will tell you, we will be issuing a report very soon. And she's going to go over some of what we've learned and then you can expect to see that report very soon. So Ngozi, you want to take it away?

Ngozi Onunaku: Absolutely! Thanks Linda! So I'd like to start just by going over some of the background as well on the Councils and then saying just a little bit about some of the trends that we're starting to see that you'll get more detail on once the report is issued. So just to start, I mean, at this point most of you or all of you know the authority by which the Councils were passed through the Head Start Act, as Linda pointed out. These were one-time funds of \$100 million. And there were three overarching goals: one being to ensure statewide collaboration and coordination among early childhood programs and services; also improving quality through early childhood systems; and improving service integration for children and families. And Linda pointed out there is a 70 percent match that was required by States, and I just wanted to show you what that match looked like.

States used different sources of funds that could count as match, and what you see here are the different types of match that States used. So if you look at the largest pie, that's State funds for preschool and preK programs, so you can see 27 percent of States use that as their 70 percent match. More importantly, if you look at some of the other slices on the pie you'll see that there are combinations that States use. So you'll see, for instance, State revenue plus private grants, or State revenue plus in-kind donations. So States were quite flexible in the way that they combined their sources of match. So we want you to keep that in mind as we think about some of the next steps with the Councils once the Federal funds have run out.

On this slide or at least the information on this slide is something that you're familiar with. So these are the lists of Required SAC members on the councils. The red ones are representatives that all Councils should have. And then in the bottom you see that they're coded in blue, and that's just because that there is an OR. So you'll notice that the States could choose to have a Part C Representative or a Part B, 619 Representative. And likewise, with health and mental health States could choose. On the next slide

what you see is sort of a breakout of how States chose to go about the Part C, Part B, 619 Representation on the SAC. So the pie on the far left is Part C, so we see that 48 Councils, or 98 percent, have a Part C Representative. The pie in the middle is the Part B, 619 Representation, so you'll see that 36 Councils, or 73 percent, have a Part B, 619 Representative. And then finally the last pie on the right shows which Councils have both. So you'll see that there are 35 Councils that have both, or 71 percent.

The next chart or the next slide shows the mental health and health representation. So on the left you'll see that 25 Councils, or 51 percent, have mental health representation. The middle pie shows the 41 Councils, or the 84 percent, that have health representation. And then you'll see the pie on the right that shows which Councils decided to combine and have both, and that's 20 Councils, or 41 percent.

This next slide here shows the different types of government that's represented on the Councils, so these are not required by law but some Councils chose to include these representatives. So you'll see that for the Governor's Office there are 28 Councils that do have someone from the Governor's Office sitting on the Councils. But in terms of State Legislative Representatives, there are 20 Councils that have this type of representation. And then local government, 14; and in terms of the Judicial Representative, 8. I do also want you to keep in mind that these are fluid numbers. Sometimes they're changing, because they're sometimes new Council members and there are various types of changes that happen with each State. So this is kind of captured at a point in time. Okay.

On this next slide, this is just the last piece on the types of membership found in the SAC, and again, these are not required by law. But what we noticed was that there were a lot of representations from business, so 65 percent is Business Representatives; 64 percent of Foundation Representatives; 57 percent of Governor Representatives; a lot of Parent representation, 55 percent; and in terms of Tribal and Migrant Representatives, 20 percent each. And then with military child care, we saw 27 percent of Councils having this type of representation. I just wanted to say a little about the committee formation. So we did a scan of which Councils have what types of committee, and we noticed that there were 22 Councils, so almost half, that had some kind of a PD or workforce; either committee, subcommittee, or a subgroup working.

We also noticed that a lot of Councils had a data committee or data workgroup, and we also noticed that there were—other groups that stood out were public will/outreach and communications, family support and home visitation, both of those groups at 27 percent. We also noticed that there were a number of Councils that focused on finance and economic development and sustainability and thinking about how to continue the work of the Council or to support early care and education initiatives in the State, so this is even outside of the State Advisory Councils. Also a lot of attention on quality and QRIS; and then finally health and mental health. So these are the ones that really stuck out for us; I'm sure there are others. It's actually important to just share with you some of the challenges and opportunities we saw or we learned from Councils in the very beginning.

As you all know, in 2010 there were a number of gubernatorial transitions, so that change was pretty important in terms of the way that the Councils were able to move. So many Councils chose to wait for the new Governor to come on board and others decided to file ahead. But that was a transition that

impacted the movement of the Councils. Likewise, State legislative budget authority was another important factor. Sometimes Councils had to wait for the State legislative session to conclude before they had the authority to spend funds. Because these were ARRA funds, sometimes States had additional State requirements that they had to follow before they could spend ARRA funds as well. There were also some State procurement procedures that Councils had to adhere to. So in terms of executing the contracts, there were many other steps that Councils had to follow through with. The fifth bullet shows the State Approval to Hire Staff. Sometimes there were hiring freezes and so that challenged Councils at times. Restructuring of Government and the State Advisory Councils is related to the first bullet in that sometimes when new Governors came on, they've chosen to restructure the Council and so that impacted the speed at which Councils could get started, or sometimes it meant that there were new members, or that the context or the scope of the work that the Council was doing had to change.

Another important thing is stakeholder engagement. Very wisely so, many Councils thought that it would be important to engage stakeholders in the work that they're doing to make sure that they were thinking really comprehensively about the way that they're doing their work. And then finally, there were some lessons learned that emerged in terms of technology challenges that came about in the data systems development, and you'll learn a lot more about that when the report comes out, but this notion of just being able to create a data system from scratch was not as easy as many States originally imagined that it would be, so those technology challenges were pretty important.

So what I wanted to do now is just kind of brainstorm very quickly, go through the seven requirements that all States and territories are required to do work on regarding the SAC grant, and I just wanted to just kind of highlight some of the trends that we've seen in each of those required activities. So the first Legislative Requirement was conducting a periodic statewide needs assessment on the quality and availability of care, high-quality care. So we saw a lot of States, as you would imagine, collecting data and really describing the number of children birth to five and their families who are eligible for early childhood services. Many States also did a geographic or community assessment to get a sense of which high-needs populations are in need of services according to the geographical areas. So some States or a few States might have used geomapping or like the Early Development Instrument, the EDI, to determine communities with greatest needs. The third bullet points out to the prevalence of risk factors. So some Councils examine how other risk factors, such as poverty or homelessness or unemployment, and how that impacted young children in their needs assessment.

And finally here, another trend that we saw with the need assessment is that some States gathered information from parents or the early childhood education workforce to get a sense of what the gaps are and what the strengths are.

Okay, let's move on to the second requirement. So that's identifying opportunities for, and barriers to, collaboration and coordination amongst Federal-funded and State-funded early childhood programs and services. So what we saw is that there are a lot of advisory group combinations, so States tried to combine as much as possible other kinds of advisory groups. So you might see a SAC that combined itself with ECCS, the Early Childhood Comprehensive Grant, or they might have started with the Home Visiting Advisory Group or with the ICC.

So as a trend we also noticed that there were some Councils that did local collaboration models and other States that set this public and stakeholder engagement. In the interest of time I'm going to try and breeze through these a little bit faster so that we can get to the States who we're actually going to talk about their work. So I'm going to go ahead and move forward, but these are the trends, and this presentation and the webinar will be posted, and what we'll do is e-mail you all with the link of where it will be.

Okay, so the third requirement has to do with developing recommendations for increasing the participation of children in care. And what we saw was that States have performed some levels of research to figure out how this kind of increasing participation could occur. Many did innovative grants; some decided to expand home visiting with the SAC's funds; some have worked actively on developing legislations, working with their State legislature, working with their Governor; and some have actually formed committees on increasing the participation of children in care.

Requirement 4 is developing recommendations for establishing a unified data collection system. So what we saw here is that a lot of States used expertise from key stakeholders through data summits, roundtables, advisory groups to explore developing common data elements and data sharing methods and procedures. We also found that a lot of States were doing data mapping and gap analysis to find out what pockets of early childhood data existed and what is missing. Many worked on developing unique identifiers for the improvement of policies. Many did some work around data sharing. We know this work is complex so to navigate data sharing rules. For instance, some States may have developed a data sharing prototype to serve as a roadmap and some States have done a data sharing pilot to get a sense of where are things now and what can they learn from in terms of actually fully implementing data sharing, because of the complexity of the topic.

The fifth bullet here is design questions development. So many States use their energy to think about what kinds of data [we would] like to find and design questions that would help them to get there. And finally, we are learning that there are a number of States that are trying to link their Head Start and Early Head Start data to their P-20 Systems. For the fifth requirement, developing the recommendations for creating or enhancing statewide PD system and career ladder, we saw a lot of States creating opportunities for scholarships for early care and education professionals. Many devoted their energy to Developing Core Knowledge and Competencies Framework. Some developed career lattices; others have put a lot of work into developing a professional development registry or enhancing what they already have. Some developed resources for trainers. Some SACs actually thought about which trainings they needed to have and created a series of topical trainings for professionals that are listed below.

And then finally, we see that there are many SACs that tried to align their early childhood professional development plans with other sectors in the States; health being an example of that. This next slide here is the sixth requirement and that's around developing recommendations for assessing the capacity and effectiveness of 2- and 4-year institutes of higher ed. So here we see that States were trying to get a sense of, well, what capacity does higher ed have in terms of supporting early care and education providers? They also aligned their coursework to State early learning systems, so trying to make sure that both the coursework that's available in these institutes of higher ed aligns to what we

know that providers ought to be able to do, note and do in terms of the early learning systems. Many States invested in innovation and many States established agreements with higher ed so that, for instance, when a provider moves from one university to the other they don't lose credit.

Finally, the last requirement here looks at recommendations for improvement in State early learning standards. And so here we see that many States worked on beefing up their infant and toddler standards, if they didn't have them already; many focused on cultural linguistic considerations. Some States created early learning standards and kind of built that out a little bit more so that it impacted the kind of education that early care and education professionals were receiving. So aligning the standards with the kind of education provided to providers.

The fourth bullet points out that there are States that align their early learning standards across their programs, so not just in child care or in other sectors, but across all the various early learning programs. The fifth bullet here is early learning standards for parent and community engagement. Really making sure that the standards were not just for providers, but it's something that parents and the community could also understand and use. And then finally, developing standards so that it includes first through third grade. One other point here is that many Councils advance their systems beyond their SAC requirements.

So here you see examples of work that's been done over and beyond what's required in SAC work. So kindergarten entry assessment development is one area; really beefing up their QRIS; work on health and mental health; as well as parent and family engagement. So the next few slides that I'll go over have to do with leveraging knowledge and funding and initiatives. So what we found that the Councils have been able to do is to really leverage different sectors, the different kinds of early childhood education programs. So they've done this with Child Care, Head Start, ECCS, the Home Visiting Program, Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge, the Strengthening Families Model, the ICC, and Project Launch through SAMHSA. So we raise this because we think that this is an important model as Councils think about furthering and advancing their work. So here are just some examples of how the SACs leveraged ECCS. And I won't go through all of them, but the first point here you'll see that many ECCS members led the writing and the submission of the SAC application.

You'll also see that ECCS provided staff support to the State Advisory Councils. Many of them worked together to align their work to avoid duplications, and in some cases the SAC is responsible for implementing the ECCS plans. We see the same kind of leveraging going on with the SAC and home visiting. So we've learned that some States have aligned their priorities in order to avoid duplications. They tend to use each other as a sounding board and they've also consulted each other on data systems developments.

And finally, we see that there's some work being done to build early childhood system capacity at the community level. By the way, I just want to talk about leveraging that we saw between the Council and the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge. So in every case of the 37 States that applied to Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge, they all looked to their SAC plans to help them inform the development of the applications. And we also learned that the development of the applications help States to go back and reflect and refine their Council work. So I'm just going to end there and just,

again, remind folks that we will send out the link so that everyone knows where to find the presentation. And then I'm going to go ahead and hand it over to Don Titcombe from Texas.

Don Titcombe: Hello! Can you hear me?

Yes.

Don Titcombe: Okay. Now I'm going to try and attempt to show my screen. Do you see that?

Yeah.

Yeah.

Don Titcombe: Okay. Well, my name is Don Titcombe. I'm the Manager of the Texas Early Learning Council. I'm very honored to be invited to speak on this webinar and I'm excited to share with you a lot of the accomplishments that the Council has achieved over the last 2 years. Ngozi asked me to speak a lot about sustainability. I'm going to try to interweave that when talking about some of our accomplishments. Just so you know, I'm not going to go over every single thing that we've done, I'm sure you guys are all familiar with the work because I think many of the States' works overlap a lot. I'm going to try and hit some key things that I think that are unique to Texas or that we're particularly proud of and go from there.

So our Council is chaired by LaShonda Brown. She's the Head Start Collaboration Office Director for our State. It was previously chaired by John Gasko, Dr. John Gasko, who is the Director of State Initiatives for the Children's Learning Institute. And I particularly wanted to put them on here in the beginning just to point out how important it was, I think, for the Texas Early Learning Council to have their leadership early on in the development of the application and then throughout this process. I've had the luxury of being a manager and working actually in the same office side by side with both of them, and I think that that's really given us the ability to make things happen fast, to be able to be in contact with the Chair, to make decisions, and to have that extra piece of leadership and vision has been very helpful. So for what it's worth, I think that those two are really responsible for where we are today.

The SAC grant itself gave Texas the opportunity to really plug some holes in the State's early childhood system or patchwork for early childhood that I don't think that we'd be able to do otherwise in the amount of time given and with the lack of resources that we have in the State for these types of things. What you see on the screen there is our full strategy chart and our work is broken into four areas; Data and Quality Rating and Improvement System is one area. Then we have Collaborations and Standards, Parental Outreach and Communication, and Workforce and Professional Development. And within all of those we've done at least three or four major initiatives or what's added up to large initiatives. And like I said, the SAC grant gave Texas the opportunity to come in and very tactfully sort of take those funds and use them appropriately in a fast way so we can really get some impact and so we're really grateful for that.

I'm going to talk about—I want to go through initiatives in each of the areas, the priority areas that we have and talk about highlights and sustainability, and then if you have questions later on at the end of

everybody's presentation, I think I can take them then. Starting with Data and Quality Rating and Improvement Systems, and the name itself I think it's clear what we're working on; one was the Interagency Early Childhood Data Warehouse that we were calling TOTS, which stood for the Texas On-Track System. Like Ngozi said, a lot of States had the vision of actually building one; we were one of those. And we ran into some problems.

Oddly enough, the problems were not necessarily the technological feasibility of it. That was actually rather something we felt we had a good handle on. The thing that was the stumbling block was governance, and the agencies coming together for agreements on how data would be shared and who would actually host it. And it's not that those were impossible tasks, it's that without direction from the legislature, there was differing opinions on how that should go, and so naturally many of the agencies were sheepish about committing without legislative direction. So we switched directions and decided to change that to a series of recommendations. We did our recommendations in the domains of technology and specifically governance, because we believe that was the big stumbling block. And I think we also advanced the concept of data in the State a lot by doing our statewide data conference.

We brought together key stakeholders in early childhood that previously thought that data is a good idea, but hadn't really had this vision in their mind that we could have this interagency system that could be used by multiple stakeholders. We have an indepth, about 300-page strategic plan that should the legislature say that they want this, we have the step-by-step process on how to get there. We actually have joint requirements for the actual build of the system, so move the ball forward significantly. And just so you know, in changing directions we asked the Federal Government for permission to repurpose these funds, and some of the stuff I'll talk about today we used for that. Like I said, we got the strategic plan out of that and we also had the recommendations.

The recommendations were sent statewide to major stakeholders, to legislators, and obviously to the Governor's Office, and we hope that maybe there will be a movement in the legislature this year and something will come out of it. With Quality Rating and Improvement Systems, Texas has a Quality Rating and Improvement System. It's single sector, it's limited to child care, and it's limited to subsidized child care. We've been working for the last year on trying to chart the course to make that a more of a multisector system and to sort of update what we've learned about quality over the last 10 years and incorporate that. We've done a lot of work on this project; namely that paper you see there, "Where Do We Go From Here," sort of sets the stage and does an assessment or maybe a diagnostics of where we are in the State with quality improvement and what it would take to get to a full-fledged Quality Rating and Improvement System.

We brought in highly qualified consultants that worked with us on charting the next steps, and to do that we brought together successive groups of stakeholders and put out successive versions of that strategic plan. And now, much like the data system, we have a pretty clear blueprint to follow. The next steps for the Council with regards to the Quality Rating and Improvement System are to bring that Subcommittee together to really figure out the depths and the breadths of the recommendations that we'd like to make the State better, are we going to make high-level recommendations with respect to governance and who should be in charge? Are we going to go down and actually recommend what the quality peers are as a block system and stuff like that? And that's on the agenda for next month to get

together with that Subcommittee. In terms of sustainability with both TOTS and the Quality Rating and Improvement System, obviously, [there are no] tangible items there to sustain right now.

So what we're really talking about is sustaining the—sustaining the momentum of working towards those things. There are some signals that we've created some lasting—some lasting hope that they can get done. For instance, multiple bills have been filed in the legislature, our session just began, one sort of does relate to QRIS. And recently we've had some testimony in the State of Texas regarding how schools are funded and early childhood data and, to be clear, the lack of data collection came up, which shows sort of like a need. So hopefully there will be some recognition of the Council's work on this and somebody will pick it up.

For our Public Outreach and Communication section, we did a needs assessment, like every State is required to do. Our main needs assessment was a gap analysis where we looked at demographic data and we looked at supply side data, what slots we had to meet the needs of the demographics data we have, and we merged those two together and discussed the gaps and where we need to go, not just today, but in 5 years, and then into 2040, with some of the projections. I would like to highlight that as well, but given the time that we have I want to talk about what makes Texas unique with this regard. We overbudgeted, not intentionally, but it came that way that we had some money saved from our needs assessment. And so to the Council's credit, they really jumped on exciting new things. I'm sure many of you on the call have interacted with, but at the UCLA Center they used the EDI to do community planning around early childhood, in partnership with United Way Worldwide. And we went to a presentation from UCLA, I think that the Administration for Children and Families put on, and Dr. Gasko, who was Chair at the time, immediately fell in love with the idea. I was interested in it as well. We brought it back to the Council and brought them in. And essentially we used some of our funds to do a competitive grant to cities in Texas to compete to collect EDI data, Early Development Instrument data, bring together stakeholder groups locally, so sort of like local Early Childhood Councils, and use that data to make a plan and think about how they're going to invest their local funds, like United Way Funds. What we have here called Workforce Dollars, which is a lot of the money that we use for child care subsidies and early childhood quality improvement. So we wound up funding for communities.

What you see on the screen is sort of an example of the data that they got. I don't have the talent or the time to explain the complexity of what you're seeing, but basically those are printouts of different locations across Texas; you have Brownsville, San Antonio, El Paso, and it's their demographic data overlaid with their early childhood domain needs and deficits. So [there are] pie charts that look like little Trivial Pursuit pies are sort of the frequency of different deficits and domains that we see in young children in those areas. So something like this gives those local communities a really good, dense snapshot of what's going on with children, what are the specific needs that they have in early childhood, and give them a tool and framework to work through to actually try out interventions and then look into the future to see if those interventions have made an impact on these local neighborhoods.

When you talk about sustainability, we're thrilled to learn that the Health and Human Services Department here in Texas took a lot of their home visitation funds, because we have 11 communities that receive home visitation funds in the State, and will be using the EDI and this model to evaluate the

effectiveness of those grants as well. So Texas now I believe leads the United States with the amount of these EDI sites and we're really excited and proud that we were part of pushing this model of data collection and community planning forward with the early childhood funds.

Another thing that I'm particularly excited about, that's been a wonderful experience for me, is we used our Texas Early Learning Council funds to create New Infant and Toddler Early Learning Guidelines for the State of Texas. I should say New Infant and Toddler and 3-year-old Early Learning Guidelines for the State of Texas. As you may or may not know, we currently have preK guidelines and so now, like I said before, this would give us the opportunity to fill some gaps. This is one of the huge gaps in service that these funds have allowed us to do. And our methodology for doing that was to bring together a bunch of stakeholders. We partnered with ZERO TO THREE; it helped us sort of vision how we should go about the process. And then we went through a very intense year-and-a-half-long process where we had academics from Children's Learning Institute and the stakeholders sort of interim process of passing the guidelines back and forth and improving them and making sure that they held to the vision of the stakeholders and then the Council itself approved them. We were able to do them in Spanish too with the funds from this grant. And the guidelines themselves have been a huge point of connectivity for the Council.

I won't go through every one of these arrows, but essentially they play a critical role in early childhood; I'm sure many on the phone can understand why, but one of the things is those bring sort of the early childhood education field and the physical health field to the pediatricians there together. We were able to do a partnership; they're going to endorse these. We're going to pair up with Reach Out and Read Texas and distribute them through the pediatricians' network, so we're very excited about that. These guidelines are often trying to fund or fuel our public awareness campaigns, which is a multimedia, television, radio, online campaign about best practices for raising young children, how to find a good quality child care center, when is it appropriate or how you should be prepared for going about screening for disabilities. The messages in the Infant and Toddler Early Learning Guidelines are going to fuel that campaign.

Furthermore, we partnered with the Texas Literacy Initiative, which is the Striving Readers Fund and the Early Learning Guidelines and the stuff that goes along with it, are going to fuel a lot of the ZERO TO THREE interventions for that grant across the State of Texas, so we're super excited about it. We hope to have them published and out by mid-February. Another thing that makes Texas very unique, which is under the Collaborations and Standards banner, is our work on family child care or home-based child care, and particularly our work related to what we call BEECH, which stands for Beginning Education: Early Child Care at Home, which is a study and an online project and a mentoring project. The Council recognized the amount of family care in the State of Texas, the history of family care, with it being some of the most isolated providers from training and quality improvement and some of the most outreach kids in the State are involved in home-based care. So John and LaShonda and the other Council members really wanted to close one of those gaps and really make an impact on that.

So what was envisioned is creating an online training module that was specifically crafted for family-based providers, that they could use in their home, on their time, and we would hopefully be improving quality. So the Council partnered with researchers from the Children's Learning Institute and

we based our model of intervention off of something called PALS, which is Play and Learn Strategies. And this is really an intervention for parenting, but when we started really thinking about it and the Council interacting on it, we found more similarities in family-based home with parenting strategies than we do with traditional center-based child care centers, in the sense that they have mixed groups, mixed ages, it's in the home, and the sort of pathway to that profession isn't always the same way that it is in centers, so based it on that.

And what was created was a very large 20-hour module for training on all the different domains of development, on responsive care giving, and how to even engage different groups. And it's a very accessible online platform. It's much like you would experience Blackboard, if you are in higher ed, very affordable and very usable. It comes with videos, audio recordings, downloadable tasks, but then also the interactive development that assesses for knowledge, just as you're paying attention as a user. Now, this is where it gets complicated; the Council funded the creation of this, but also funded the study to see how effective it was. And so we funded a randomized control trial, which to our knowledge is the only randomized control trial of family-based child care intervention ever. And so we created a three-cohort study with a group that was not getting the intervention, a group that was just getting access to the module, and then a group that was getting access to the module with a mentoring relationship. And we're currently in the process of conducting that research and collecting that data. And then also not investing in the data system, as I've talked about earlier, saved us some money so we were able to build the entire thing in Spanish as well, so we're very excited about that, and we're also doing a randomized control trial in Spanish as well.

And then the last thing I want to talk about—oh, and sustainability with regards to this is, this is ideally going to be housed in the Head Start Collaboration Office and we intend to open it up for access for a nominal fee, if not any at all, we still have to figure out how much administration needs to be done, but this should live on forever through the Head Start Collaboration Office. And then finally, the Texas Early Childhood Professional Development System is a significant thing that the Early Learning Council has been a part of. The system has always existed, but it has lacked certain components that have always been on the agenda, but never have the resources to get done. So what the Council participated in, if you look at that first column there that says Components, we've really thrown a lot of weight towards getting those components done.

Today, if you follow us on LISTSERV, we published new core competencies for practitioners and administrators. We've created a new career ladder for the State of Texas. We are currently studying how to create a better higher education articulation agreement so that we will have a better pathway from training to junior college to higher ed to practice. But then we're also creating an actual online registry that I'm sure many of the States listening online have already. Texas did not have this. We have a trainer registry, but it was not online. We currently just finished the business requirements for an online system and we'll be releasing that RFP very, very, very soon. And the sustainability of this system, this will be housed also in the Head Start Collaboration Office, but this already has its own staff person, and we hope that through the usage of the trainers registering and different workers registering and administrators registering for a nominal fee this will be a self-sustaining system that will live on well, well, well past the SAC grants. Like I've said, we accomplished a lot of other things and we

still are in the process of accomplishing other things, but I wanted to hit the highlights given the amount of time. So thank you very much for listening and I look forward to your questions at the end!

Ngozi Onunaku: Thanks very much Don! So we're going to move forward to the New York State presentation and the co-presenters will be Bob Frawley and Sherry Cleary.

Bob Frawley: Good afternoon! I'm Bob Frawley and I have the privilege of co-chairing New York's Early Childhood Advisory Council with Sherry Cleary, who will also be presenting with me today. We're really happy to provide a quick overview of our work and accomplishments here in New York and answer any of your questions. Sherry is going to talk a little bit more about the impact of the State Advisory Council Initiative, but I wanted to say right upfront that it's been a significant impetus for moving our early childhood systems building efforts forward.

During the period when the Head Start Reauthorization Act was moving through Congress with requirement to establish the State Advisory Councils, in New York State the Governor's Office and the Commissioners of the our State Health Education and Human Service agencies were working together and determined that a priority activity for their work going forward should be billing the system of comprehensive support and services for young children and their families. So they designated that the agency that I worked for, the Council on Children and Families—I'm actually up one slide, here is where I'm supposed to be—the agency that I work for, the Council on Children and Families, should take the lead in this effort.

The Council coordinates with 12 State health education human service agencies in New York State with the objective of creating a more effective and efficient service delivery system for children and families. We've been involved in early childhood issues since the late 1980s. If you think of the Council, the Council is very similar to many other States that have children's cabinets or commissions. I think the unique thing about the Council on Children and Families is that we also have a staff of about 20 that essentially serve as the cross-systems coordination infrastructure for the State. In addition to leading the State Advisory Council Initiative, the Council also serves as the host agency for the Head Start Collaboration Project, the Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems Initiative, and Project Launch. So it's this infrastructure that helped us build the kinds of relationships we needed and then provided the staff support that we used to establish the ECAC and really hit the ground running. We established the ECAC as a public/private partnership. As Deputy Director of the Council on Children and Families, I serve as the public sector co-chair and then Sherry, who is the Director of the New York Early Childhood Professional Development Institute, serves as the private sector co-chair.

You ever heard of a large Council? We have 50 members, all with a wide range of early childhood expertise and representing public agencies, both at the State level and New York City and counties across the State. And then we have people representing private, not-for-profit professional associations; advocacy organizations; higher ed unions; and foundations. Very early on in the development of the ECAC we established a vision that represented our cross-systems approach and we also agreed to mission statements and guiding principles. We were kind of fortunate in that just prior to establishing the ECAC, the Governor's Office and the Commissioners had signed off on our Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems Plan, so we were able to move almost immediately towards implementation. We did as an ECAC sit down with the ECCS plan and develop a strategic planning

document that with a little tweaking essentially collapsed our 50-page Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems plan into a 4-page document. Both the ECAC Strategic Plan and our Early Childhood Comprehensive Services Plan were divided into four focus areas: Healthy Children, Early Learning, Strong Families, Coordinated and Responsive Systems, and we'll talk about our work in these four areas moving forward.

First I just want to say that to carry out our work we established six workgroups, as you can see there. All the workgroups are staffed and they include members from the general community in addition to Council members. In the Healthy Children focus area, we essentially have four major activities. We're developing resources for making evidence-based training and consultation more available to support the wide range of health, mental health, and early learning professionals meet the social-emotional development needs of young children. We're implementing several strategies to ensure that all young children receive routine developmental screening. We're seeking to prevent obesity and support healthy lifestyles. And we're doing this through including relevant standards into our QRIS. We're working to increase participation in the Child and Adult Care Food Program. And we're also looking to increase the number of breastfeeding family centers in the State. And then finally, we're working to strengthen our network of child care health consultants. So now I'm going to turn the presentation over to Sherry and she's going to talk about our work in the Early Learning focus area.

Sherry Cleary: Thanks Bob! So in the Early Learning area there are two specific goal areas or workgroup areas; one is Quality Improvement; the other is Workforce Development. I'm going to talk about both of them. I'll start with Quality Improvement first. The slide you see before you highlights QUALITYstarsNY, which is New York's very new Quality Rating and Improvement System. And I would say that New York is a true latecomer to the QRIS work, and for a long time we felt very badly about that until we realized what an advantage it was. So we've learned from all of your trials and tribulations and we thank you dramatically for that. We designed a QRIS system right before there was an ECAC and we used some ARRA funds to do a field test and really test out our functions, and we took those findings and made revisions and looked at ways to support an initial implementation, and then used ECAC funds, staff, support to raise additional funds and to launch an implementation.

Our focus is on learning environment, family engagement, workforce qualifications, and experience, and we look at management and leadership. It's a five-star system that's open to all regulated programs in the State of New York, and so that includes Head Start Child Care, school-based preK, center-based preK, and family child care. And we're in the very beginning phases of implementation, so we currently have invited 450 participants into the system and so we're up and running. The ECAC then submitted a proposal to the Governor, not yet funded, but we're optimistic that over time we'll be able to identify some significant public dollars to support it. And so that's just one example of where we've leveraged ECAC funds to create policy and impact practice.

Another thing that's very new that we haven't spent a lot of time talking about just yet is the fact that the ECAC is also in the Early Learning and Quality Improvement goal looking at establishing a common metric. So I'll only say this that City agencies in New York City generated this idea and the State has since joined the City agencies through the ECAC to really envision how to create a common metric, which is—instead of—for the moment a kindergarten entry assessment, but would enable preschool

teachers to use the research-based assessments they're currently familiar with to assess their children and to guide curriculum planning and instruction. But all of those assessments would feed into a common metric, giving those of us in the policy world a window into how we're doing, what needs to change, etcetera.

So then the next focus of our Early Learning is certainly on workforce, and to that end we've created something that we call New York Works for Children. It's a system that I'll actually show you a picture of later, but for the moment, just quickly, we've used our ECAC support to create a competency-based core body of knowledge that we have now distributed to every—we've published it and we've distributed it to every licensed center in the State and we sent it to every faculty member in the State of New York in early childhood, with the expectation that they would use those competencies to revise their course design outlines and to impact the way they do field experience in their teacher preparation programs, and the way that they evaluate students that are getting ready to graduate from their teacher preparation programs.

We too have developed early learning guidelines. They span first to age 5 and they are aligned with our New York State's PreK Foundation for the Common Core. Our PreK Foundation for the Common Core spans all the domains, and so we saw it as imperative that we create a document, a companion document that not only looked at ZERO TO THREE, but actually crossed over through age 5. We established a Workforce Registry known as ASPIRE, and this is designed to really look at all aspects of our workforce: qualifications, experience, education. And then we developed a Trainer's Credential, and then of course the Trainer's Registry is part of the Workforce Registry. We have a couple of initiatives looking at higher ed. We have in New York the good fortune of some very functional articulation agreements. We wanted to use our ECAC money to go further, and so we are piloting a public higher ed community partnership activity where we're going to be working with two higher ed institutions in the State to develop [] further relationships with their communities and to take some responsibility for new paradigms in professional development. And we're curious about credit-bearing professional development, we're thinking about onsite coaching and mentoring. So that's all taking place. And we're about to do a statewide survey of all of the early childhood education programs in higher ed to look for areas of opportunities there. Bob, I'm going to turn it back over to you for the next slide.

Bob Frawley: Okay. So in the Strong Families focus area we're seeking to strengthen family engagement practices and policies. And one of the things we're doing is implementing a statewide Parent Café Initiative. We're also working closely with an existing group, the New York State Parenting Education Partnership to expand evidenced-based parenting education statewide, and through that initiative we're developing a Parenting Educator Credential. We're providing parenting educator training and we're developing a Parenting Guide and a New Parent Kit. We're working with another existing group to develop a comprehensive home visiting system. So I'm going to turn it back to Sherry for the last focus area.

Sherry Cleary: Thank you! So you see this big focus area about Coordinated and Responsive Systems always sounds a lot easier than it really is, and we've taken a lot of specific steps to operationalize what this really means for us in New York. And so we have developed a plan for a comprehensive early

childhood data system. Of course it will take much more money than is available through ECAC's funding, but we—this has earned us a lot of credibility in the State and people are clearly wanting to partner with us to realize this, we just have to—it's going to take a little bit longer. Something that we have completed is a very impressive cost estimation model with a return on investment component and we think that this is going to serve us really well if we start to introduce more and more of the components of our system building. And clearly we've looked at financing strategies. I think we always look at financing strategies.

We were instrumental in putting together a white paper on Social Impact Bonds for the Governor's Office so that they could consider that concept in a very comprehensive way. And then I would mention that we operationalized this in our daily work; our Strong Families and Healthy Development Workgroups are very, very active in our Quality Rating and Improvement System. Our Social and Emotional Support Subgroup is very engaged with our Workforce Development Workgroup. So there's a lot of ways that we try to move the system forward to be integral and one of the most recent powerful examples of the effect of the ECAC on systems was in the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy. In order to coordinate the efforts to understand the depth of the impact and to marshal all the available resources to respond to the early childhood needs that precipitated from the storm, the ECAC had a pivotal role. The relationships that we've made over the last 2½ years were key in helping State agencies be very, very nimble in their response, and it was just a great thing to see in action.

So this last slide is an approach to talking about sustainability that we felt might be helpful and interesting to those of you that are on the phone, because it's a tangible example. So what you see is our Workforce Development System that we built through the support of the ECAC, and all the components in the rectangular boxes are either already now built over the last 2½ years or in process. So as an example, the Career Ladder is completed, and some of the things that you see in the circles are completed. And one of the things that we realized was that there might not be a refunding of ECACs, and so what we did, not unlike Texas, was we built the things or the components that would live with or without funding, so that we could have the peace of mind that we have built infrastructure pieces that could live on.

Now, I guess what I would say is that with continued funding, either from similar sources or new sources, we would be able to continue the momentum of this work in dramatic fashion, and we worry sometimes that this momentum would be slower without new or renewed funding. But I guess in closing what I would say is that this Federal funding empowered our members and provided a neutral place for individuals and agencies to innovate and collaborate, and it also went a very long way to mitigate barriers, territory turf. And people have really embraced their responsibility for New York's success in making early childhood a priority. And I think Bob and I both see that the sustainability, while it depends dramatically on more funding, it also is dependent on these relationships that have been established and really are embedded in the fabric of the State now. Thanks!

Ngozi Onunaku: Okay, thank you so much Sherry and Bob! So now we're going to have the last State presentation from Jada Rupley and Heidi McGowan from Oregon.

Jada Rupley: Good afternoon everyone! This is Jada Rupley and joining me is Heidi McGowan and we're glad to be a part of this from the State of Oregon. And we chose to focus on a couple of different

elements and we have much more going on. As you heard from both Texas and New York, there's very exciting initiatives going forward with the Council. So if we can advance to the next slide. What we have is Governor Kitzhaber elected with the health and education reform agenda. And his vision was by 2025 that we would have 40 percent of Oregonians that would have had earned a bachelor's degree or higher; 40 percent of Oregonians will have earned an associate's degree or postsecondary credential; and 20 percent of Oregonians will have earned a high school diploma or its equivalent.

And if you look at that in the next slide as we go to the vision and focus, what that actually looks at the creation of the Early Learning Council is we have created an Early Learning Council for Oregon that serves both as the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care, as well as the Head Start Advisory. We looked at part of the creation of a birth to 20 education platform and there were significant amounts of State reorganization to be able to look at that in a single department, as well as looking at how we work out within the State. So as part of that birth to 20 education reform we look at children ready for kindergarten, we look at children that are raised in stable and attached families, because what we know is that being ready for kindergarten is extremely important, but you have to address the needs of families up to this. And then also what you'll see is we have integrated systems that some new approaches are in process to be able to do. And so now we're going to go to talk about our Results to Highlight, and we have three slides to be able to do that. And Heidi McGowan is going to take this from here.

Heidi McGowan: Thank you Jada! We're just going to touch on just a few highlights happening here in Oregon. The Kindergarten Readiness Assessment is a real high priority for our Governor, who is interested in data on children entering kindergarten and how we're doing as a State and how our children are doing. As I think was shared in the last presentation about Oregon is that in legislation last year, the legislature directed the Department of Ed and the Early Learning Council to jointly develop and implement a Kindergarten Readiness Assessment. The Council in July selected a composite approach that would give us a snapshot of a child entering kindergarten. This was piloted this past fall in 16 schools and diverse settings: urban, rural, and various ethnicity groups and income levels. And we now are refining our process based upon a process evaluation that will be rolled out statewide in fall of 2014. Currently we are embedding this into our K–12 assessment system and the Department of Education State Board will actually be looking at this tomorrow to look at adoption into administrative rules. So the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment is an accomplishment we feel proud of and the Governor is watching this closely.

A next area is the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. We currently—this initiative is a culmination of quality improvement initiatives for all early learning and development programs in Oregon. It also builds upon a rating and improvement system that, in the last 3 to 4 years, we've been collecting data on research-based indicators in all of our early learning and development programs, including family child care and center programs. And so our TQRIS will be launching this January actually, as we speak. We currently have developed standards that are appropriate for family child care centers as well as Head Start or preK. And our goal this coming year, in 2013, is that 250 programs will be on our TQRIS and then it will roll out statewide in 2014. We are very grateful for the support of the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge that will help us expand this at a rate that we probably

wouldn't be expanding at. So those are two areas to highlight. And then the next area on the next slide just relates to Legislation.

Last year House Bill 4165 not only included the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment and the TQRIS and the work of the Early Learning Council, but it also did some consolidation at Sunset 3 Commissions and Councils and combined them into the Early Learning Council; Head Start Advisory Board was one of those and the Early Learning Council now is the governing body for all early learning programs. It also developed a design for community-based coordinators of early learning services and asked the Early Learning Council to design a new local model or regional model that Jada will touch on here just briefly. The Council was asked to identify functions, criteria of an RFP, and then would report back to the legislature here in 2013, starting up in a couple of weeks. I'll pass it back to Jada who can carry that forward.

Jada Rupley: In part of the legislation we are talking about the Community-Based Coordinators of Early Learning Services and that has been shortened to the Hubs, and there has been a workgroup ongoing being able to look at those ways that we might align services for children and families with family at the top of the focus as well as children. And we often find that sometimes while programs, or this patchwork of programs all offering good services, sometimes there is duplication that goes on because of the fact that people have different guidelines that they look at. So for example, you could end up with multiple home visitors going into the home for various reasons and could we not look at a way to do a community-based model that might be able to address more children, because we know that there are more children and families than we have programs to be able to serve.

So as we looked at implementing our vision by integrating and bringing child services together for communities, we're looking at how we connect health. And one of the other initiatives that Governor Kitzhaber had was to look at how to do a coordinated care model for the healthcare system, which has just implemented 14, what they call CCOs. And so how can we tie to a coordinated care system as well as moving this in to the early learning? We are in the process right now of going back for a second session looking at kind of refining that legislation, but there's some tremendous findings that have come out of these community workgroups. To be able to look at that we would basically ensure services across the States, that they will start beginning in the—part of the end of 2013, beginning of 2014, and they will self-identify in the statewide RFA to be able to look at what areas to cover and what services.

So the two beginning things that we're looking for is that they would take their outcomes and they will become an outcomes that all programs will measure within this defined community, as well as publish their budgets together so that there would be a comprehensive children's budget for children birth to six. The idea behind that is, if you look at the resources oftentimes probably in all of our States our resources go through various departments, various subcommittees in the legislature and when you take a look at a comprehensive children's budget, like other States have done, it's an amazing exercise for folks to look to say, oh, my goodness, let's see how we can do these things better. So that's the process that we're looking at.

We look at rolling out the RFA process at the end of this legislation. We suspect that, that will probably be around May with communities in the process of building that right now. We did a series of forms

around the State and feel like the community conversations are probably things that some folks have never talked together before and they're looking at different ways of providing services. So we're excited to see the outcomes that will move forward with that one.

And then finally, if we look at the results of the 2013—next slide—like I said, there is finishing legislation to be able to look at, that will be an Early Learning Division in the Department of Education rather than a separate department, as well as working out in terms of governance and the integration of State delivery systems. So the area that we want to make sure to look at is that communities will work together in that defined geographic area, they will create strategies to improve outcomes, reduce duplication, and increase coordination so that children are ready for kindergarten. And the assessment at the end of that would be, as Heidi just talked about, is the Assessment for Kindergarten will give us the chance to look forward for third grade reading, as well as do a look back to see how we can better serve some of those communities with children. And then all State-funded services will coordinate the outcomes through an analysis of that children's budget. So with that, and the next slide, what we'd like to say is thank you very much for including us in this presentation and we look forward to questions! Thank you!

Ngozi Onunaku: Okay, so we're going to go ahead and turn over to the Q&A portion. We did get a few questions that came in, so I'll just read the question, and if it's for ACF, we'll answer it, and if it's for one of the presenters, we'll turn it over to the appropriate presenter.

So the first question is, with only 40 percent of SAC funds spent to date, can ACF redistribute funds? And so the answer is no. As you may remember, these are recovery dollars. So any recovery dollars that do not get spent do not come back to HHS. They actually go to the Department of Treasury, so they are gone forever. So with that we encourage you to spend your SAC funds within your allotted time period.

And so this next question is a good segue for your allotted time period, so the question is, remind us of the obligation date and the liquidation date? So you all have different dates for your project period. So your obligation date is the end of your project date. So if your project period ends May 31, that is when all services and all goods must be completed. And then regarding liquidations, you have 90 days after that to pay out any final invoices. So activities and services should not happen during this 90-day period. This is just paying of final invoices, completing your final report. And you'll be receiving more guidance through our Office of Grants Management on that as your end date comes up.

The third question is, can you get the raw data, and I'm assuming that's on some of the data that I presented earlier was who's gotten what kind of participation, and that will be included in the report. There's also a question about, did we include States who declined the SAC funds, and the answer is no, we did not include those in the report and in the data that's presented. This is just those States who accepted the federal fund.

Next question we got is, can you comment on possible future funding? I'm going to turn to Linda to answer that question.

Linda Smith: Well, I think that there is—it's a really hard question to answer, number one, and I think that the real answer is that I think the execution rate right now is working against any efforts that we might try to do here at ACF in several levels, because the low execution rate being less than 50 percent more than halfway into this is problematic for us, and it doesn't help us justify anything moving forward. So I think the short answer is probably not. Right now we're interested in the work continuing and certainly this webinar and the report is going to help us with that, but I think we're very focused right now in getting that execution rate up and getting the money spent on projects like you've just seen. That would help us in anything that we might want to put forward in the future.

Ngozi Onunaku: The next question we received is, can we obtain a copy of the BEECH Random Control Trial Setting? So Don, that's for you.

Don Titcombe: Sure! Well, yes and no. No in the short term, because the study will actually—once all the data is collected, the study will probably come out next year. But like any other study it will be submitted to journals and such for publication. But if you—whoever was that asked me that or put that question out, please feel free to follow up with me and I can definitely put you in contact with the actual researchers who are the principal investigators on it and perhaps they can share information with you as it develops.

Ngozi Onunaku: Thanks Don! So we've got another question that reads, can Oregon share who they worked with to develop the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment? Yeah, so that's for Jada or Heidi. Well, they might be muted, so whoever asked the question if you want to send it to me, this is Ngozi, if you want to send it to me I can be sure to get it to Jada and Heidi and make sure that you get a response. So lost connectivity. Okay, so they said yes, they can share but they lost connectivity. So if you could email me I'll be sure to get it to them.

Okay, the next question is, to date are we working with libraries? So there are a couple of answers—is that, we did issue an information memorandum earlier last year to talk about the different ways that we can work with libraries. So if there are some of you who have not received that, we're happy to recirculate that again. The other thing is that we've become aware that the Institute of Museum and Library Sciences are getting geared up to work on the campaign for grade-level reading and may have some early childhood grants to offer, so that may be another really important place of synergy. The other point that you should know is that we have a meeting with the IMLS group next week just to talk about some of these issues exactly, so I would imagine that some more ideas will come from that meeting and we'll be sharing those with you shortly. So yes, it's on our mind and I think we're looking for different ways to continue to work with the libraries. And those are all the questions. Oh, wait, there's another. Okay, so we'll—

Don Titcombe: Ngozi, I actually had a question, this is Don, I know I'm violating the rules, but I—

Ngozi Onunaku: No, no, it's totally fine Don, go for it.

Don Titcombe: With regards to the spending, I think the thing that's tripped us up the most is not necessarily not having the things suspended on and stuff like that, it's sort of the confusion around, well, we know we've changed our mind about this, we know we can spend a lot of money, but first

we've got to get approval and stuff like that. I know that the nature of these grants is a little bit different than most of the grants I've ever worked with, with regards to the ease and how the budgets are written to be flexible. I am wondering if there's anything that can be done at ACF to allow us to have more flexibility getting things spent quick, I don't know how to say it, but like more allowance to make decisions very quickly that are in the interest of spending the money faster. Does that make sense?

Ngozi Onunaku: Yeah, sure, and I'll say this, this may not answer your question completely, Don, but I—because of our concern—I mean, and we understand what all of those challenges were in the beginning in starting up and why there were delays, so we totally get that. One of the things that we're doing looking ahead and moving forward is to have a discussion with each State and to ask each State to make a projection about what they think their expenditures will be starting now, all the way through the end of their grant. So I think that will be a good forum for us to hear about any need, budget revisions you might have coming down the pike, so that we can be prepared for them and we can have a better sense of what to expect expenditure-wise.

Don Titcombe: Okay.

Ngozi Onunaku: So I think that's all of our questions.

Linda Smith: Okay. Well, this is Linda again and I just want to thank Ngozi and the crew here for putting this together, especially to Texas, New York, and Oregon for their presentations. They were very, very informative and we were all sitting there just telling them with some of what we were actually learning. I know that there are many other States with lessons learned and as we get them we'll continue to try and share what we learn. I think one of the things that we were asking ourselves is how can we make linkages to some of the various products that have been put together and we will work on doing that in terms of getting you access to some of the materials.

So with that, I think that we're in good shape. I want to stress again that we're going to be putting the slides from this presentation on our website and Ngozi will be getting the information out to you on where that will be. The report should be out shortly. It's in the final layout stages right now. And I guess in closing, thank you to everyone out there in the States who have worked so hard on these State Advisory Councils! I think you're going to be really happy when you see the report, because I think it really bespeaks the work that has gone into this over the last couple of years. So we're very proud of it and all that you've done and let us know how we can help. We stand by in any way we can to help you close these grants out and get the maximum out of them. So thank you everyone!