

State Advisory Councils Final Report & Implications for the Future Webinar 6-2-2015

>>Tricia Haley: Thank you so much for joining the SAC webinar today. We're excited to talk with you and we have a robust agenda, but we want to make sure that we give everybody a chance to get on. Our numbers are still climbing. So we're going to give it just another minute or two and then we will get started.

Hi, everyone and welcome, once again, to the "State Advisory Councils Final Report & Implications for the Future" webinar. Thank you so much for joining us. We're excited to have you on.

You may have noticed by this point that your phone lines are muted. It's so that we can avoid having any background noise coming through, but it doesn't mean that we don't want to hear your thoughts and questions. In fact, we would love for you to chat them in through your chat box throughout the course of the webinar. We're hoping to have some time at the end for Q&A and any questions that we can't answer we will still have a record of. So we'll know what folks are wondering and thinking about out in the field. So please don't hesitate to chat those our way.

We also will inevitably get the question of whether or not these slides will be posted online. They are not currently posted on line, but our plan is to post them along with the full webinar and transcript as soon as we can make them compliant with all of our charming Federal regulations. So it'll probably take a few weeks, but they will be up eventually, and we'll send out a note to let you know when they do go up. So following that, without further ado, I will pass it over to Linda Smith, our Deputy Assistant Secretary for Early Childhood Development.

>>Linda Smith: Well, I want to thank you for that and we're very excited to have you with us today here for those of you who are out there around the country and we're sitting here looking at the Nation's capital and the wonderful view we have here. I just want to open this up with just a little bit of background on the State Advisory Council, because I have a personal interest in this and something that dates back a little ways in terms of where these originated. And as some of you have heard me say in the past, these actually were a vision of the late Senator Edward Kennedy.

And he had this vision for these State advisory councils of groups of people that could truly bring the different funding streams and constituencies together to make more sense out of what was going on around the country in early care and education. And this was way back in the 2000-2001 time period. And obviously, he passed without being able to see these come to fruition the way they have, but it gives me a great deal of pleasure to present this final report to you all and to thank everyone around the country who has given us information and done all of the hard work to make the State advisories really a functioning and very effective part of our Federal agenda.

So I wanted to just talk a little bit about, because I've been through the report and I have to say that I think it's a beautiful report, what it says about each and every one of the States and the work that they've done on early childhood, but also, moving us closer to the vision. I think this is going to be one of those reports that's going to be more or less one of the unsung successes of the Federal initiatives of the last several years, something that contributed a lot to other things happening in the country, but not

itself getting a lot of press. So this is our chance to basically call out the hard work of the State advisory councils and everything that they have accomplished over the last several years.

I've had the privilege to be out and about in the country and then able to sit down with different people in looking at many of the things that people have tried to accomplish with the SACs and just been a part of hearing some of the successes as you've worked through them out in the States. And so there are so many things that have gone on. Work around data systems has been so important, the early learning guidelines, updating them, making them birth to 5, professional development systems and investments in creating registries, mental health consultation, that's been amazing, working on funds for home visiting, needs assessments, family and parent engagement.

I mean, the list goes on and on. And I think one of the things that I would say to folks as you read the report is to look at it as a source for how you can go to other States who are doing like work or who have interests like you have in your State, what you're working on, that you can go to some of these other States, look at who's doing some of these things and contact them, reach out and create your own communities of learning based on what other State advisory councils are doing. So the work has been amazing. We have several States on today that are going to talk to you about the work that they've done.

I did have the pleasure of being in Utah and saw the early workings of what was going on in Utah with their data sharing systems that they were working on. It was truly amazing. So I'm going to just say a couple words here about the staff here in Washington. We've had two proud parents of this report and they're sitting with me today.

One of them is Marsha Basloe who has been working with this consistently and then the person I'm going to turn this over to will lead us through the first part of this is Ngozi Onunaku. And just to let you know, we've had a baby here.

We consider this report having given birth to a baby. And if you know Ngozi, you know that she is going to have a baby and it was a race here in Washington as to which one would come first and we're proud to say, the SAC baby made it before Ngozi's baby.

So Ngozi, I'm going to turn it over to you, and let you walk through the basics of the SACs and then you let Marsha take it from there.

>>Ngozi Onunaku: Thanks, Linda. I don't know how my baby feels about being upstaged by the SAC report, but here we are. So thanks very much for the introduction, and I just also want to make you aware of who also will be presenting today.

So after I speak, Marsha Basloe, Senior Advisor here at HHS, will also present on some information that comes out of the report. And we also invited some states to present. We thought it'd be really important for you to hear from your colleagues about the work that's happened in their States with the State Advisory Council.

So we've invited Leanne Barrett from Rhode Island, Colleen Murphy from Utah, and Nicol Russell from Arizona to present and share some information about how the SACs have played out in their States and some of their major accomplishments. So today, we're going to provide an overview of the final report. We are going to also highlight some accomplishments that has happened with the SAC grant over the 2010-2013 grant period. We're going to feature some State examples from those 3 States that I mentioned and then we also want to share some implications for the future.

So while the Federal funding has ended at this point, we really want to talk about the future and where we see the SACs going and also hear from you in terms of what you're doing to keep your SACs moving ahead. So I'll start with some background. Most of you know this already, but for those of you who are new to the discussion, the authority for the SACs came from the Head Start 2007 reauthorization. And with the 2009 ARRA or American recovery dollars that provided \$100 million to the State.

You probably already know the 3 overarching goals, but we'll just recap them for you. One is to insure statewide collaboration and coordination among early childhood programs and services; second is to improve quality; and thirdly, to improve service integration for children and families.

We just want to tell you a little bit about the organization of the final report. You'll notice once you access the report that the format feels pretty similar to the 2013 mid-term report in that it provides background on the SAC grant, information on the State Advisory Council legislative required activities and State profiles on each of the 44 States and 5 territories that participated in the SAC grant.

What's unique to this final report is that it also includes what SACs ultimately accomplished. So you might remember in our 2013 report, we talked about SAC accomplishments to date. So this report really highlights what States actually accomplished with the full grant. And then finally, a discussion on the future of the SAC. So those are all the things that you'll find in the report and this slide just breaks down the different pages on which you can find these various topics.

Okay. So we also want to begin by talking about the SAC State leadership. We are pulling out some of the major findings here and highlighting what we found in the report. And what we found is that the state leadership had substantial involvement in the councils, meaning that in most States, government officials at the executive and legislative levels participated and provided leadership on the SAC. So as pointed out in the slide, here you find that in 44 States we have governors that requested and received supplemental SAC funds in addition to the original funds that were made available to States. And the implication for this is that 88 percent of States were able to use additional Federal funds on building a high quality comprehensive State early childhood system.

In 35 States, which represents 71 percent of SACs, we saw that representatives from the governor's office participated on the council and this was not required. So we think that, that's a pretty important finding and it shows the interest of governors and their staff in participating and leading the council, which is important when we think about sustainability and keeping the councils going. In 20 States, which is about 41 percent of the SACs, we found that a representative from State legislature participated on the council.

And that's equally important in States where the legislatures are really focusing on early care and education and really trying to build in the infrastructure to keep early care and education visible and important for the States in terms of resource allocations and making sure the children are at the forefront of policy. In 25 States or half of the SACs, a representative from local government participated on the council. So that might be, for instance, a mayor or a city council member. And that, too, we found to be important, because we know that the work that's happening at the State level often really takes shape at the local level.

And it's really the local work that really matters. And so, to have local participation in the SACs, we found to be really important. Again, all of these that we're pointing out were not required members, but we did find that these were important trends. In 20 States or 41 percent of SACs, we found that the State legislature actually passed laws to support or sustain SAC activities and initiatives. Now, we want to turn to the legislative requirements. So these are the things that Congress actually wrote in in terms of what is required of the State Advisory Councils.

So Legislative Requirement 1 required the need for States to carryout needs assessments on the quality and availability of high quality care. States took 2 different approaches to completing their needs assessment. So as you can see in the chart on the right, 38 states or 78 percent of them completed comprehensive needs assessments, meaning that they looked at the full range of early childhood needs in the State. Another 11 states or 22 percent completed targeted focus needs assessments to address specific concerns in early childhood.

We also want to point out that in Legislative Requirement 1 on the needs assessment, that councils took the needs assessment data to identify and prioritize resources based on the need and identify gaps. So as you can see in this chart, it's slightly more than half of States produced needs assessment documents and that includes briefing papers for Senior State officials or private stakeholders. You can also see that the other half developed things like strategic plans, reports, or mapping documents, to inform the public about needs and resources.

At the end of the Federal SAC grant implementation, we asked councils to recommend next steps they might take based on their needs assessments and States told us that they would like to do a few things as next steps. One was obtain funding to increase the number of slots for programs in children, including hard to reach populations or children with special needs. They also talked about wanting to continue development of early childhood data integration systems. Many of them began some work in developing recommendations, and out of those recommendations, saw the need to continue this data systems integration work.

Thirdly, they told us they'd like to improve family and general public education on the importance and availability of high quality early childhood services and finally continue professional development systems improvement. So those are some of the next steps that States identified in terms of what to do with the needs assessments that they completed using their SAC grant. So let's move to Legislative Requirement 2 and that required States to coordinate the various Federal- and State-funded early childhood programs and facilitate collaboration among them.

We found that States reported extensive collaborations across a variety of stakeholders. The vast majority of States indicated successful collaborations, especially around services to children with disabilities and with home visiting programs. So for instance, we found that 46 States, which is about 94 percent worked with their home visiting or MIECHV programs. In 34 States, which is about 69 percent, councils reported that their CCDF priorities changed or had the potential to change as a result of needs assessments completed by the councils.

We found that 34 States or 74 percent reported that their councils collaborated on the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge by providing things like expertise, resources, planning, and application preparation. In 48 States or 98 percent, those States worked with the IDEA Part C Program to enhance services offered to children with special needs from birth through age 3. And in 45 States or 92 percent, those States worked with Section 619 coordinators, which is Part B of IDEA to increase service for 3 to 5 year-olds with developmental delays.

And in 43 States, we found that 88 percent of councils collaborated with ECCS programs, and that's the Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems grant. That preceded the State Advisory Council grant. So let's talk a little bit about Legislative Requirement 3. That requirement asked States to work on increasing the participation of children in early care and education programs, including outreach to underrepresented and special populations. And over the 3-year grant period, we found that councils approached this task in many ways. So we've just highlighted the themes we found across their work and those are the 3 bullets that you see on the screen.

So the first bullet is that councils worked on building or improving State infrastructures. And by this, we mean that councils worked with their partners and stakeholders to improve State policies or service delivery mechanisms to help more children access high quality care. This often meant creating family friendly policies to increase enrollment of eligible low-income families in child care programs, including modifying child care subsidy eligibility policies to ensure that more children access child care and have continuity of care, once they receive the services.

Some States passed legislation that funded more early care and education slots for infants, toddlers, and prekindergarteners. Some States created a new office for early childhood dedicated to increasing the participation of children in care. In the second bullet, we point out that the councils leveraged resources. And by this, we mean that councils leveraged actual financial resources in the State to expand services. States who did this were able to provide more slots in programs and in some cases were able to reduce costs by sharing services.

And in the final bullet, we learned that councils collaborated with partners to increase services to special populations in underrepresented groups. And we found that most of the councils' efforts here centered around serving dual language learners and children living in rural populations. So now I'll turn it over to Marsha Basloe, Senior Advisor at ACF, to continue with Legislative Requirements 4 through 7.

>>Marsha Basloe: Thanks, Ngozi. So when we look at Legislative Requirement 4, it was to develop recommendations for establishing a unified data collection system. And Linda already mentioned that she had the opportunity to see one State really focus on this and you're going to be able to hear more

about that. The recommendations from the States were really unanimous. The first two bullets on this slide highlight that as a next step, States discussed wanting to develop an integrated and accessible system that can be used as a central warehouse or platform where cross agency data is then collected, stored, and transferred.

They also talked about linking existing systems, State longitudinal data systems, kindergarten entry assessment data systems or quality rating and improvement data systems for data use. They also saw the need to establish data governance to insure that the proper policies, guidelines, and elements for data collection are established for data sharing. For example, they wanted to develop an institute articulation agreements and other memorandum of understanding agreements to insure that there was a common understanding of the framework of the data sharing process.

They discussed the importance of establishing and maintaining security of information in privacy protections. They also focused on the need for funding to build the technical capacity, the actual staff, the people who understand how to do this, the personnel; and for funding for infrastructure to maintain, upgrade, and then sustain the data system, once it's built. They discussed a need to pilot implementation, not to move immediately into it. And lastly, they recommended unique identifiers, the process of creating unique identifiers.

In Legislative Requirement 5, which required States to establish recommendations for creating or enhancing a statewide professional development system and career ladder. You can see some interesting dynamics in this chart. It talked about developing recommendations. But we found that the work completed by councils really compelled the States to not only examine and recommend, but to actually improve the status of their early childhood workforce in a variety of ways. So the bar graphs shows just that, 29 States, 59 percent used SAC funds to create or enhance support, knowledge and competencies framework in their State.

Eighteen states, 37 percent used SAC funds to develop or enhance their workforce registries. And 22 States, 45 percent used SAC funds to improve their career ladders or lattices. And although this information is not shown on the graph, we also learned from the States that 57 percent of them used SAC funds to complete a workforce study. Twenty-five percent, a quarter of all of them reported developments in all 3 workforce areas: core knowledge competencies, workforce registries, and career ladder utilizing SAC funds.

And finally, 38 states, 78 percent now have developments in all 3 workforce areas from prior work, the SAC or a combination of both. So the SAC funding really has helped States moved the needle on advancing professional development. Important foundational work when you think about the length of the recent NAF study that just rolled out. Legislative Requirement 6 required States to develop recommendations for assessing the capacity and effectiveness of 2 and 4-year institutes of higher education in supporting the career development of early childhood educators.

Again, this legislative requirement asked that States develop recommendations, which all States completed. This chart shows how States went beyond the requirement and actually did some implementation work. The chart shows how States actually implemented the next steps that came out

of the recommendations. So you'll see here that in the left bar, 22 States, 45 percent of councils used their SAC funds to align higher education coursework and competencies to the State Early Learning System, alignment of higher education coursework to the guidelines, or to the early learning standards.

You'll also see that States have been able to leverage other funding sources, including Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Funds or other preexisting funds, such as CCDF. In the right bar, you'll see that 7 States, 14 percent actually used SAC funds to establish agreements, such as memorandum of understanding or articulation agreements, which built on another 7 States, 14 percent that had preexisting agreements. Legislative Requirement 7 required States to develop recommendations for improving statewide early learning standards.

As you can see from this chart, there's 100 percent for 3 to 5-year olds. As you know from the work in your States, all States had already developed and published early learning standards for 3 to 5-year olds, but prior to the SAC grant they may not have established infant and toddler early learning standards. So to meet the grant requirements, States were mandated to make recommendations to improve their standards so that we now had birth to 5, the whole age span. All States exceeded this requirement in the sense that they went beyond making recommendations.

In addition to making the recommendations, 45 States, 92 percent further revised and strengthened their existing standards for infants and toddlers or they actually created new ones. And all States enhanced their standards for preschoolers. So what? You know, why actually are we looking at this? You know, we wanted to actually give you some information on the impact of the SAC funding. So this slide and the next slide really answers that question, so what. It summarizes the SAC accomplishments with \$100 million investment and I want to go over some of the highlights.

There was increased access to high quality early care and education programs. We saw comprehensive early learning and development standards covering all domains of development, aligned and improved early childhood program standards, increased higher education opportunities for the early childhood workforce and significant developments in the quality rating and improvement systems. We had increased access, valuable information developed for and disseminated to parents on how to support multiple needs of young children.

We saw improved health in mental health services, streamlined professional development systems, comprehensive systems, including the beginning of kindergarten entry assessments and advancements in the development of integrated early childhood data collection systems. When you look at these two slides and you think about the investment that \$100 million made, there's really a lot to answer to so what.

Having said that, I'm going to turn the presentation to our first State, Rhode Island, and I am pleased to introduce Leanne Barrett who is a senior policy analyst at Rhode Island KIDS COUNT with the core responsibility for early childhood policy birth to 8 statewide. She is the coordinator of the Rhode Island Early Learning Council and co-wrote the State's winning Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant application. She's provided leadership in developing BrightStars, the State's QRIS, designing the Rhode

Island preK program, and advocated for multiple early learning in Rhode Island. Leanne, we're pleased to turn it to you.

>>Leanne Barrett: Thank you very much, Marsha. I will just start out with the beginning of the Early Learning Council, which was 2010 under Governor Carcieri, who is now 2 governors ago. We're on our third governor under the Early Learning Council. And I just wanted to make the point here that the ARRA funding was incredibly important to get us motivated to form an official Early Learning Council. Sometimes we like to say in Rhode Island that our State pastime is going into meetings.

We had lots of meetings of steering committee for BrightStars, we have a child care advisory committee, we have our Successful Start. We had a lot of groups, but the fact that we created an Early Learning Council that was appointed by the governor elevated it to a whole other level and allowed us to do cross-departmental collaboration at another level that we hadn't been able to do before. And the carrot of having money available and a requirement from the Feds that you had to have a Council was what got us to do it as a State.

And the continue inclusion of requirements and other Federal opportunities, like Race to the Top, I think the preschool development grants also had that requirement. So I just wanted to pass that along to my friends in the Federal Government, that having that stuff is very helpful at the State level, because sometimes you get into a State where we think, do we really need another planning group, we have so many already. But it is very helpful. So that was the launch of our Council, which has been going strong, since it was established.

The co-chairs have been stable from the beginning. Our co-chairs are Elizabeth Burke Bryant from Rhode Island KIDS COUNT, who are a statewide, children's policy organization that does a lot of analysis of data. And Debra Gist, who has been our commissioner of the Rhode Island Department of Education, and they've provided very strong leadership from the beginning, including lots of involvement at the subcommittee level as well. We have a 20-member Council and a 20-member workgroup, and workgroup members are also on the subcommittees that includes the directors of all 5 State departments that are responsible for early care and education.

We have diffuse governance and the council has been a key part of keeping the directors and also the middle managers all have an opportunity -- it's not the only opportunity they have, but one good opportunity to connect with the members of the community around planning for early care and education. We also have key provider groups on the council, including the Childcare Directors Association, Family Childcare Homes of Rhode Island, the Head Start Association, and key intermediaries. And we connect to other planning groups intentionally.

We still have a separate ECCS, the Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems committee still meets. So we have the person who chairs that also coming to the council. And our early intervention has the ICC and the chair of that is also on the council. And we try to make connections whenever we can, because we all like to go to meetings, and our State is small enough that anybody can get to the statewide meetings pretty easily. At this point, we now have 5 subcommittees, and I can tell you what those are on the next slide.

But the other key things that I wanted to mention at the beginning is that our Council has been very involved in the development of our Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge application, which happened -- you know, we had to write that in 2011. The end of 2011, we were one of the first rounds to win. So it started in 2012 and a lot of the work that we've been doing in recent years has been very connected into the core work of the Race to the Top grant. And there's regular updates and opportunities for feedback on implementation of the grant at all of our Council meetings.

And another key thing we have is we have a website for the council where we post all of the minutes and key documents that come out about early childhood, either key reports or things that are out for review, those kind of things. And we send out an e-news that probably goes out once a month with key happenings in early care and education in Rhode Island. And anybody could go sign-up for that if they want, that's the website right there. So next slide. So I described a little bit about the structure of our Council.

We have been very committed to a public/private partnership throughout where there is somebody from inside government and somebody from outside government, because we both recognize that we have key roles to play. And actually, having people outside government is helpful when we go to the legislature. We don't have legislators on our committee because of a separation of powers rule, that this is considered a governor's committee. It advises the governor and then we have a separate system for legislators.

Legislators still come sometimes. Sometimes we specially invite them, but they're not officially members of the council. But that, again, sets us up for the inside/outside, because some of us as advocates on the outside can play a different role when we talk to the legislators and people who are in the administration. So our co-chairs I talked about already, Department of Ed. and KIDS COUNT. We at KIDS COUNT play a very strong role in lots of these subcommittees and we consider this a core part of our work.

We actually raise our own funding through private philanthropy and are able to bring that as a sustainability mechanism that we can help provide staffing support and key leadership to lots of these committees. So you'll see the leadership of those 5 subcommittees. Access, we talk about expansion, then access to preK, Head Start, full-day kindergarten, child care subsidy, early intervention and preschool special ed. We also -- I should mention, our charter specifies that our Council is birth through age 8. So we have full-day K as a core part of our work.

We're actually going forward really looking into what else we can do through the council to improve alignment from birth through age 8 across the whole spectrum. So that's a key part of it. Quality subcommittee really talks about improving the quality of licensed programs, in particular and we talk about licensing the Quality Rating and Improvement System, which is BrightStars and our preschool approval standards. Our workforce subcommittee is focused on professional development.

We have a brand new center for early learning professionals. We do a lot of work with higher ed. and we're developing a workforce registry, which we haven't had before. Our Early Learning Standards and Assessment Committee is focused on our new Early Learning and Development Standards assessment,

including developmental screening, formative assessments, and the development of our kindergarten entry assessment. And our data subcommittee is focused on making sure we have the right data to inform policy decisions and overseeing the development under Race to the Top, where most of the resources come for that, of a more connected and comprehensive data system on early care and education in Rhode Island.

The Council also sponsors some community forums on top of all of these meetings. We have forums at night or other opportunities for people to get together that are open to the public to gather input on key documents that are under review or when we were doing licensing revisions, opportunities to give input into that process before the actual draft licensing changes came out. So it's different than a hearing process. It's another way of getting input early on on key parts of the system that are going through a change.

Key accomplishments. So I started out this slide with the early accomplishments, which are from 2010 to 2011 primarily with the ARRA funds. So early on, we really focused on that developing recommendations part of the law, that one of our goals was to get our Council together and really tackle some of the very challenging issues and to develop a set of recommendations that were then approved by the council and could inform the work of the governor.

So we developed specific recommendations on increasing access across all of the different sectors. We developed recommendations that, yes, Rhode Island needed and wanted a statewide coordinated early learning data system and that work was also supported by the National Governor's Association in 2010. They had an opportunity for States that had a governor's appointed advisory council to get support, primarily technical assistance from NGA, to help put together a plan. So we did that work with NGA as a core part of a subgroup of the council in 2010/2011.

We developed recommendations that we wanted a statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment and what kind of KEA we wanted and how it should be developed and we developed recommendations around a professional development system. So all 4 of those recommendations was wonderful, because in 2011 when the Race to the Top application came out, we had written SAC documents that had gotten consensus and buy-in from the council.

And we could list lots of language of work that we had already done and plop it into the RTTELC application, which was huge around making sure you had enough time to get that application done, but you had already done all of this work to build consensus, and buy-in around those strategies. Another key thing we did, when we had developed BrightStars, we did it in a period of time in Rhode Island when we had very little money. In fact, we were cutting access to child care, and rates had been frozen for a while.

So we developed a QRIS without really a lot of financial support. So with the ARRA funds we wanted to better understand the cost of operating a program at the various levels of BrightStars. So we worked with Anne Mitchell. We used ARRA funds to hire her and she did a great analysis and some of the other States have probably seen the tool, which is the TCQC, which allows you to put in different scenarios and estimate a cost of operating a program at various levels.

And in the middle of doing that, that helped us then with Race to the Top, because we had a better understanding of how we could budget when we had extra financial resources, how we should best use those resources to incentivize and support higher quality care. And the last bullet on this page is about T.E.A.C.H. So teach was something that we had been talking about in Rhode Island for at least 10 years before the council got started. We knew that in BrightStars we had higher ed. standards and that you needed to have, for example, associate degrees; bachelor's degrees at the highest level.

You needed to have 12 to 24 credits in the early childhood education. And we didn't have a strong system to help people get those credits. So we knew we wanted to start T.E.A.C.H. and with the ARRA funds we were able to connect with the Rhode Island Foundation, a local philanthropy to get T.E.A.C.H. off the ground, at least providing associate degrees at that point. So next slide is where we overlap with funding from Race to the Top. So very early on, we got that Race to the Top grant and a lot of the work was joint between the council and Race to the Top.

So we updated and expanded our Early Learning and Development Standards to include infants and toddlers. We were one of the States that did not have that. Originally, with the ARRA funds we were just going to adopt another State's. We were going to review all the other States and adopt infants and toddlers, but with the Race to the Top funding we were able to do a much deeper dive with much better consultants and staff support. And we developed a brand new set, which I've heard are generally considered to be pretty good for a State's set of standards.

We also worked with securing experts to review and update our child care licensing regulations, particularly our centers. Our centers hadn't been updated since 1993. We conducted a statewide study of early learning workforce and licensed programs. We conducted a study of the higher education institutions in Rhode Island that provided early childhood educational course recommended degrees, including a set of recommendations about how we can improve the higher ed. offerings.

With Race to the Top, we were able to expand the T.E.A.C.H. model to also support people to achieve bachelor's degrees. And as part of our data work, which most of the data work is being funded through Race to the Top, but part of it that we did early on, was expanding our KIDSNET data system, which is run by the health department and it's a universal database of children born in Rhode Island to track developmental screening from birth through kindergarten entry so that pediatricians can log-in information about developmental screening and we have a better understanding of who's getting a screening and who's falling through the cracks.

Okay, next slide. So after that early work, some of that is, obviously, still continuing on, we developed a strategic plan, which was adopted and finalized by the council in 2012 and it runs from December 2012 through December 2016. And it has goals and strategies in each of those 4 areas. And that strategic plan is available on the Early Learning Council's website if you want to take a look at that. We do have a data dashboard that's a relatively new development. I think we've had it for about a year, a year and a half that gets at where we are in terms of achieving our goals in the strategic plan.

And I have that slide on full day K here, which is one of our best success stories, because we've made a lot of great progress over the past 2 years and we think we may be able to get to 100 percent within the

next 2 years. And last slide is current work. We have a new governor, who I mentioned, started in January 2015. We're working on refreshing our Council's leadership and membership. One of the new exciting things we're doing is, we were selected for another opportunity to work with the National Governor's Association.

And this one is focused on helping governors to better understand the early care and education system and identify some strategic priorities that the governor will champion. So we are working with NGA to update our Early Learning Council's strategic plan to identify policy priorities with her governor and we're really focusing on that birth to age 8. We haven't done a lot of kindergarten through grade 3 work, but this will give us a chance to do that. Another thing that's not on this slide is we've been working with zero to three as a subcommittee of the council to develop a set of independent toddler policy priorities, which are actually going to be released on Thursday.

So we'll post those on the council website when those come out on Thursday. And lastly, a lot of the work we're doing right now is because we are in our final year of the Early Learning Challenge grant 2015. We're working on sustainability planning for both the work that we've been able to accomplish and the work still left undone under the Race to the Top and then the sustainability of the council as well. So with that, I should turn it back over to Marsha and Ngozi to do Utah.

>>Marsha Basloe: Thank you so much. That was terrific. So I am now going to introduce you to Colleen Murphy who is the Early Childhood Utah Program Manager at the Utah Department of Health Bureau of Child Development. And she's responsible for a host of things. She's responsible for all administrative and program activities for the Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems Initiative, the State Advisory Council, the State Developmental Screening Initiative, the Strengthening Families Protective Factor Framework and the Office of Home Visiting. And so I'm really pleased to have Utah present. And Colleen, I'm going to turn it over to you.

>>Colleen Murphy: Thank you so much. And first, I would also like to thank the administration for providing these funds. Utah is not a Race to the Top State. So we were able to accomplish several things, which we would not have been able to do without this funding. So today, I'm just going to highlight some of our major activities and accomplishments. And if anyone would like more information on what I present, please feel free to contact me, because we love sharing what we have.

So some of our major accomplishments are also the -- we formed an early childhood body that we call Early Childhood Utah Early Learning Standards, the Help Me Grow State Expansion and our Utah Early Childhood Statewide Data Integration Project. Next slide, please. All right. So Early Childhood Utah was formed in 2011. Our governor actually combined the State Advisory Council with our Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems team. So that body, when it was joined together, was renamed Early Childhood Utah.

And we also have some standing committees. We have 4, the Access to Health Care and Medical Homes, early care and education, Parenting Education and Family Support, and Social-Emotional Development and Mental Health. So although the state advisory funds have expired this -- we have 40 members on

this body. So these 40 early childhood members are still very committed and we have been able to sustain that Council and we still meet regularly. The committees are meeting every month.

The standing committees continually are working toward goals to strengthen that early childhood system in Utah. So the Ages and Stages Statewide Developmental Screening Initiative, Strengthening Families Protective Factor Framework Statewide Initiative, and the Help Me Grow Utah Statewide Expansion Initiative are all examples of some of the current projects that Early Childhood Utah is working on. Next slide, please. So one of the things we were able to do, and we're quite excited about, is we were able to do the early learning standards.

The purpose of our standards is really to help prepare children for kindergarten and we have the 6 basic content areas, which you can see up on the slide. But this was really a project -- it was really a collaborative effort among many, many early childhood entities and we were very excited that the guidelines pointed out that we should work on this, because we had wanted to do this for quite some time, and it moved it up on our list. These early learning standards were presented to the Utah Board of Education and they were unanimously approved, which means that now any early childhood program located in a publically funded school must use these early learning standards.

We used some of the SAC's funds to print these standards in English and in Spanish and then we disseminated them statewide to early childhood programs and families. We really tried to get them out and into the hands of the people working with children. And then these standards, we were so excited to get to do this, because this is really the first major piece of the puzzle that we needed to do in order to attain a greater goal, which is we want to have a standardized kindergarten readiness assessment.

And we were told before, we could even look at that we had to have early learning standards that the board of education approved. So that was really exciting for us. Next slide.

Another accomplishment that we have been working on with these funds is that Help Me Grow Statewide Expansion. So after researching a variety of programs, Help Me Grow was chosen to address the need of improving those linkages of children and families to community resources. So if you're not familiar with Help Me Grow, it is a free information line that connects the families to the community resources and the child development information.

And it also is a place that people can go to get access to a developmental screening questionnaire. They use the ages and stages in Utah. And then they have that care coordination piece to make sure that families really are successfully connected with the resources. So we began program implementation in Utah County in 2010 and then we have chunked our expansion into several different phases. So the first phase that we did after the pilot was to bring it to Salt Lake County.

And then after we did Salt Lake County, our next phase was to really get into some rural counties. As you may know, we hear often that rural counties just don't have access to the services and their needs are a little bit harder to meet. So we really wanted to get out there and pilot this in those rural counties. Now that we have done all of that, we are in our current phase, which is the program has now gone statewide and we're really excited about that. So, next slide.

And then there is my favorite, favorite topic. And again, this is where Utah used the bulk of our funds from our SAC funds and that was for the Utah Early Childhood Statewide Data Integration Project. So, really the mission of this project is to facilitate that data sharing and the coordination among the early childhood programs in Utah. So here in Utah, we have a large variety of early childhood programs and services that are available. However, these programs are funded and administered separately.

And the data from all of these programs are maintained independently. So we have really been struggling to really get a complete understanding of what is it that the families need, how do we collaborate and coordinate these needed services. So this project really takes key data from multiple early childhood databases and we integrate that into an early childhood data system. And then eventually, that will go into the State's longitudinal data system, which will then give all of us in Utah a usable source of data from early childhood through elementary, secondary, post-secondary and into the workforce.

Our hope is that this will enable agencies and programs to then track long-term outcomes from early childhood investments and make better informed policy and resource decisions. If you would go to the next slide, thank you. So our data project, we have 5 broad policy questions that we are looking to answer through this data collection. So, really number 1 our big mission is we want children to be healthy and ready to learn. So we want to look at our children birth to age 5 on track to succeed when they enter school.

And then a really big thing that we wanted to look at is which children and families are getting the services, but then which children are not getting any services, and why. Is it because they don't need any services? Is it because they don't know where to go for services? So we wanted to look at that. And then what characteristics of these programs are associated then with those positive outcomes? We really want to be able to say, look at all of these kids, look at these third grade reading scores and the ones that are really on track and doing well, what early childhood programs did they have in common.

And then we really are looking at those education and economic returns on the investments and then we really want to use data to influence how we make policies and how we use our resources. Next slide. So this is just a really basic slide showing how our system works. Again, all data is kept within the individual data sources. They have their own systems. So we pull those key elements that we want to look at from the data sources. We then gather that in that blue oval that is the Department of Health master person index.

So we bring it in there where we merge, it we match it, we then assign it a unique identifier and then we strip all of that personal identifiable information off of the record and then we push it to that gray oval, which is the early childhood data system. That is where the de-identified information sits where we can do then the research with it. We release standard reports and then we'll have ad hoc reporting capabilities, also. And then we will push requested elements onto that black oval, which is the State longitudinal data system. Next slide, please.

So finally, I just wanted to give you guys an idea of what our standard reports are. So again, we really want to make sure that our data system is truly de-identifiable information. So while we test that, we

are releasing the standard reports. And standard reports will continually be released whenever people ask for them. People can also run these standard reports by putting in their own filters. So these reports up on your screen are the draft report of our first phase of reporting. I will let you know these are still in draft form, because we are still linking data sources into our system.

So not all the sources are in yet. So once we get all of that in, we'll have pictures of cute, little early childhood experiences on our reports. Maybe we'll have to get some pictures from Ngozi of her baby to put on here. So this is just an example of what we're doing. So, one of our reports is an unduplicated count of children receiving and not receiving services in Utah. Again, we're able to do this, because vital statistics and the immunization program are data sources. So we have a really good idea of where children are, and that helps us then decide, who's not in anything.

Then we have a report on the children who are receiving services in multiple programs. We really wanted to see where is the crossover, so we can insure that these programs are talking to each other, that they're coordinating, and collaborating those services within the agencies. And then finally, we have a report highlighting the sequence in which children receive multiple services. And an example of why we really wanted that, again, we have several agencies giving resources and funds to say a Help Me Grow Utah with the primary idea that they're going to be giving out resources and linking people.

So we would expect to see how many children are starting with them and then being sent to other programs and how many children are transferring from one program to another. So we are now nearing the completion of our phase 1 and we are working on moving into phase 2. So phase 2 we will be bringing in some new data sources into our system, such as we have intergenerational poverty legislation in Utah. So we will be bringing that group onboard as a data source. And then we are working on what our next phase of standard reports will be. So that is all I have for you. Thank you.

>>Marsha Basloe: Colleen, thank you so much for the presentation. And we have another State that we want to share with you. I think when Ngozi and I set this up, we wanted to make sure that you had the opportunity to really hear from a number of your peers that were all working in different areas. So it is my pleasure to introduce Nicol Russell who is Arizona's 619 Coordinator and housed at the Arizona Department of Education. She has experience as an early childhood education teacher and program administrator as well as experience in the K-12 arena with a background in special education.

Nicol participates in many statewide leadership committees, including 2 committees led by the Arizona State Advisory Council. And so for that reason, we're going to turn this over to Nicol.

>>Nicol Russell: Thank you. I'm hoping to give you guys a good sense of Arizona and what we do with our State Advisory Council. Just for some background information, I wanted to tell you about the development of Arizona's SAC. In November, 2008 our then Governor Janet Napolitano identified First Things First, which is what we call our Early Childhood Development and Health Board as our state advisory Council, which worked out really well for us. Since First Things First was already an entity that existed, it was a natural fit for us.

First Things First was founded by a voter initiative in 2006, which proposed a tobacco tax to fund education initiatives. The governing structure of First Things First allowed for extensive stakeholder input and statewide leadership.

So when we look at Arizona, we have this vast diversity. We have rural areas, urban areas and we have 22 federally recognized tribes here. So we have a great amount of tribal land. We have 28 local regional partnership councils as well as a statewide board that is made up of governor appointees and State agency representation, which includes the Department of Education, the Department of Economic Security, and the Department of Health services.

Having this structure in place allows local decision-making and guidance to help drive Arizona's mission that all Arizona's children are ready to succeed in school and in life. If any of you are familiar with Arizona, you will know that our constituents highly value local decision-making and having local control.

So having these regional partnerships has allowed for that and it allow for having multiple opportunities for family choice, which is also highly valued here. When you look at the coordination and collaboration of our grants, the first thing that's on the slide you'll see the Maternal, Infant Early Childhood Home Visits, the MIECHV program.

In the parentheses, I put the agency that leads that. So in this case, it's the Department of Health Services. The Department of Health Services and First Things First work collaboratively right now to develop a statewide referral and data system. One part of that is for meeting the requirement of the MIECHV program to have a reporting system that measures benchmarks for families and system outcomes. The other part of that is we found that because our early childhood system is so vast and across multiple agencies, it's important that we have one place where data is collected.

Like the State before us, we struggled with this, having that unified data collection system, but we're working on it and this is one of the things that First Things First has been convening with MIECHV to help us get there. The second thing is the Child Care Development Fund, our CCDF. CCDF is housed at the Department of Economic Security. First Things First has been working collaboratively with the DES to insure alignment of programs in multiple ways. One of the ways is how we use scholarships that are provided through our quality improvement rating system, which we call Quality First here.

Scholarships that are funded by Quality First, we use as part of the match for the State funds necessary to draw down Federal dollars for CCDF. And having those 2 systems collaborate has been important, because we don't want to duplicate funding for children. So to be efficient and to insure that we're spending money wisely, there's close collaboration between those 2 scholarship programs. Additionally, one of the ways that First Things First supports CCDF is in the ongoing professional development of child care providers.

That has been a key focus of this group. The Quality First staff meets regularly with the child care staff to insure that we're providing multiple professional development opportunities to the field as well as the quality of the kind of professional development that's being received by staff members. The third thing on the list is our Head Start collaboration. So the Head Start State Collaboration Office is housed here at

the Department of Education. The director of the collaboration office is Amy Corriveau who also leads the early childhood education unit at the Department of Education.

Currently, Amy serves on the First Things First Advisory Board. That's not always been the case, but she was appointed in January of this year, which has been fantastic, because we get excellent representation of Head Start on the board as well as Head Start staff is well represented in the First Things First subcommittees of which we have multiple committees working on various aspects of our early childhood education system. Next on the slide, you'll see Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems.

So I want to tell you about 2 key things around the ECCS grant. The first one was with the initial funding received through the ECCS grant. First Things First identified a professional development system infrastructure as its key goal. The goal of the professional development workgroup was to do 3 things. One, to create a professional registry and website for professional development opportunities, and career pathways. The second goal was to develop an Associate of Arts in early childhood education that would articulate to the 4-year universities in Arizona.

So there's a lot of work with institutes of higher ed. and then other agency representatives. And then the third goal was to develop early childhood workforce knowledge and competencies, both for practitioners and for those who provide training and technical assistance. With the second award of the ECCS grant, the focus really was on mapping the systems of screening and treatment services available to children from birth to age 5 within the State. This continues to be the work of the ECCS group here in Arizona.

Right now, the focus is on building a consistent database system that will map children from birth through age 5 around screening. What kind of screeners are agencies using, including pediatricians, LEAs, early intervention programs, wherever children happen to go to be screened? Are we using a common screener? What does that look like? Who's using it? How is it being used? And can we come up with one universal screening form that can be used statewide? Now, I mentioned earlier that Arizona values local choice and having options for families.

There would still be flexibility within the use of that form to provide flexibility, but this way we could better track data on children from birth to age 5 when it came to screening if we had similar messaging and similar way to collect information. The next thing on the list you'll see Project Launch and that was held at the Department of Health Services. That has since been Sunset, but I wanted to tell you what we were able to accomplish with that, because it was highly successful here.

In Arizona, under Project Launch what we identified was that in 2 particular zip codes in Arizona -- well, I should start the other way. Seventy-five percent of our prison population was made up of 2 particular zip codes in Arizona. It's in South Phoenix geographically.

In those 2 zip codes, we did a lot of digging around this high risk population, particularly for young children of parents who are incarcerated. So with Project Launch, we were able to identify what kinds of needs these children may have, supports these families may need, how are they being impacted, what scholarships can we make available to give them access to quality care and education, etc.

The last on the list of coordinated and collaborated grants is the Empower Tobacco Funds. So we participate in the Empower Education Funds Program. It was initially funded in 2010. Ten empower standards were identified around health and safety. This included physical activity, limiting screen time, nutrition, tobacco education of parents, smoke-free campuses, and participation in the USCA Child and Adult Care Food Program. Arizona was recent recognized as one of only 3 states utilizing the high impact obesity prevention regulations in child care licensing and the funding was a blend of Federal and state funds, including State tobacco tax funds and State lottery funds. Next slide, please.

Another area of collaboration that First Things First has led is the collaboration between Part C and Part B. Part C, as you can see is housed at the Department of Economic security, whereas Part B 619 is housed here at the Arizona Department of Education. First Things First convenes quarterly meetings with the director of Part C and myself to discuss successes, challenges, commonalities, joint efforts, updates, who's doing what, how are we doing it, and where can we align ourselves.

We're working on a common data collection system to track the number of screenings, number of referrals, and follow up with families. Particularly, we are interested in this to help improve our transitions from Part C to Part B. And the third thing is school readiness indicators. So we both represented on the group that was convened by First Things First to come up with a set of 10 school readiness indicators that would be used across Arizona. Our Arizona School Readiness Framework just went to print a month ago.

So we're really excited about that, really to get everyone on the same page about school readiness. What does that mean? What does that look like? And what are the implications for the future? Next slide, please. So here's some local initiatives that we've been working on. Quality First is our tiered quality rating improvement system.

Even though this is under local initiatives, that's a statewide initiative. Locally, when we look at Quality First and what the goal of that was around the State Advisory Council, it really was the creation of our infant and toddler development guidelines and increasing access to our early learning standards.

We had those 2 set of standards for young children in our State and it really was around boosting the awareness of that and access to professional development around those 2 documents. We participate in Build Arizona and one of the key focuses is developing a unified data system. Next slide, please.

SAC funds were used for these multiple reasons. One was the professional development systems building. So at First Things First, they convened a subcommittee that works on the professional development workgroup is what we've called it and it really is about building Arizona's workforce registry and website. That's still going on at the moment and that really is about bringing a level of professionalism to our field. Even though it's a voluntary system, we've really been talking to all the key players to help raise awareness of the registry coming as well as how to participate in it, what are the advantages of participating in it.

So at the Department of Ed., we've been working with institutes of higher ed. on incorporating this into coursework, incorporating awareness of this into teacher prep programs so that students aren't coming out of university, not having heard of this, or not knowing how to join a professional network.

On the outside of the agency, there have been efforts for child care, how do we involve our child care community in the registry. So a lot of marketing talk and promotion of the workforce registry and website. We focused on building that strong continuum of birth through kindergarten learning standards. So the creation of the infant/toddler developmental guidelines and then increased access to the early learning standards. And then participation in the Quality Rating and Improvement System, Quality First. Next slide, please.

So when it comes to talking about sustaining our State Advisory Council in Arizona, we really didn't focus on how do we sustain the council, we've accepted this as a must continue at all cost. So we really have spent our energy around sustaining 3 areas of priority that we identified, the early childhood workforce professional development website and registry, continuing statewide professional development on the infant/toddler developmental guidelines and early learning standards, particularly by increasing online accessibility and capacity building.

And then third, continued participation in Quality First. Those 3 things were our priorities and we said at all cost, we will work to sustain these. So currently, it's about blending funding. So we got the Preschool Development grant. We said, how can we support these 3 priorities with the Preschool Development grant and the Child Care and Development Block grant? What are ways that we can blend funding to sustain these?

And I think that concludes where we are in Arizona. So I'll turn it back over to ACF.

>>Linda Smith: Thanks so much, Nicol.

>>Nicol Russell: You're welcome.

>>Linda Smith: We appreciate your presentation. We are going to just move onto the next slide, which is the final slide here, which really speaks to the implications for the future. So as you know, the Head Start Act of 2007 authorizes the council's remain in effect even though Federal funding has expired.

So as a result, we've encouraged States to maintain their councils. And we know it's unlikely that you'll be able to keep your SACs going at the same level as you did when you had Federal funds, but keep in mind that the Federal funds was designed to be seed money and really only constituted 30 percent of your SAC funding.

So all States came to the table with 70 percent in match funds. So that's important for you to think about in terms of funding the councils and moving forward, again, recognizing that in many instances you will have to scale back your efforts. And the implications for keeping your SAC going, they're quite huge.

On this slide, we've captured all the legislative and program requirement places that have implications for State Advisory Councils. So on the first bullet you'll see that the Head Start Act of 2007, which authorized the councils are still in effect. And so our expectation is that the councils would continue their work.

The second bullet that you see here is the CCDF Reauthorization of 2014. And in that law, there's mention of how the CCDF lead agencies and the State Advisory Council should work together. So that's outlying the CCDBG law and also found in the report. The third and fourth bullet is the RTTELC and PDG, the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge and Preschool Development Grants. And both of those have SAC membership and operation as program requirements for maintaining the grant.

So if you're one of those States with either of those grants or both, there are requirements for keeping your SAC going and there are funds that you may be able to use in the grant to support the operation of your SAC. Also, on this page we've outlined that ESEA, Elementary and Secondary Education Act bill, as well as the Strong Start bill that was reintroduced this year in 2015, all have proposed language that require some kind of work between the State entity and the State Advisory Council. So there are some pretty important implications for moving early care and education forward in your State with what's happening at the National and Federal level.

So I think we're going to go ahead and close out in the interest of time now and turn it over so that we can start to go over questions and it feels -- I think there are a few that have come in to the queue. And so we want to go ahead and start answering those. Although, I do want to go ahead and thank our 3 presenters today and appreciate them for all of their work that they've done in the State and in their presentations today.

>>Marsha Basloe: Okay. So we do have some questions and we're going to start by trying to answer the questions for you. I also want to encourage you to go to our early childhood development webpage and look for the State Advisory Council under Early Learning. The entire report is on our webpage and at the same time, you can sign up for our newsletter and get ongoing, early childhood development news.

One of the first questions raised, they said, "It was interesting, they hear great things about the SAC and I look forward to reading the report. Will you be addressing any issues related to how States, Feds, may sustain the SAC efforts since this was one-time funding, either on this call or on the report?"

And actually, we did address it in the report. So I encourage you to read the report and I'm going to turn it over to Linda Smith for a few comments.

>>Linda Smith: Yeah. And I do think this is -- Ngozi pointed out a number of possible sources of funding and places where the SACs are really emphasized and I think you will continue to see from the Federal level an emphasis on State Advisory Councils and our expectation that they continue in some capacity.

I think one of the things that I would like to highlight for those on the phone is that we are continually getting questions from Congress about overlap, duplication, etc. of funds. And the SACs are really one of

those vehicles where we hope to bring together these funding streams and make sure that we aren't duplicating our work.

So as we move forward with these, keep in mind that Congress is interested in this, watching this, the Federal Government is interested in it, and certainly looking at it. And we've had a couple of GAO studies recently about this very issue. And as a result of those studies in the Child Care and Development Block Grant, we are required to report back to Congress about the overlap and some of these things around Federal funding streams.

So we're particularly interested in keeping these going. So that said, we are looking here at the Federal level for any possible ways that we can continue to provide the resources that are needed. I can tell you and assure you that they will not be to the extent of funding that was provided in the ARRA funding stream. That was a one-time opportunity that we had and we took. But as we move forward, we're committed to keeping the State Advisory Councils going and we are looking at options that we can take here at the Federal level to keep them going.

So I would encourage all of the States that have them to keep them moving forward in some capacity as we look for funding opportunities for you. And in those 32 States that have either Race to the Top or PDG, you have those opportunities in other States. You have the State's Child Care and Development Block Grant quality funds to look at.

So there are opportunities that you have in the interim until we can take a look at how we can sustain these federally. So not a complete answer, but certainly one, where we want you to understand how vitally important we think these are. So Marsha, I'll give it back to you.

>>Marsha Basloe: Thank you. We had another question about how many SACs had Tribal representation, aside from Minnesota. And I'm going to turn that over to Ngozi, because we actually do have that information.

>>Ngozi Onunaku: So in the back of the report, you're going to find that there is a membership chart that shows not only the required members for the State Advisory Councils, but any other kind of groupings of members that we found across the SACs. And so we did look to see which State had a Tribal representative and it turns out that there are 15 States that have a Tribal representative. Minnesota is one of them. So it's Minnesota plus 14 other States, because the question came in from Minnesota.

I also think that the chart in the back is helpful in the sense that, to Linda's point is, as you're moving forward in the State and thinking about either how to reconstitute your SAC or maybe even in some cases, how to pare it down, if you had a really large one there are suggestions in the back for how you can think about the different types of members that you might include in your SAC. So again, the chart includes those that are required as well as any other kinds of members that may be helpful to you as you move your SAC forward.

>>Marsha Basloe: And we had another question that I'm hoping that Colleen will be able to actually provide some feedback on. I see the reports from Utah are generated from the Department of Health.

How did they gain access from their vital statistics and immunization records? It seems that HIPAA rules always seem to get in the way. How are you able to get around them? Colleen, are you able to answer that question?

>>Colleen Murphy: So what was absolutely beneficial and what really helped get all data sources onboard here in Utah was our data sharing agreement. So we worked really closely with the privacy technical assistance group and with the State support team to come up with a data sharing agreement that covered FERPA and HIPAA. And so once we had that in place and had that really strong agreement, the data came to us because of that agreement. And I am happy to share that with anyone who would like a copy of it.

>>Marsha Basloe: Thank you very much. And if you want to share that with us, we can have it accessible here and folks can also contact us. Our contact information is on the last slide and Ngozi and I would be happy to share that information with you. I think in light of the fact that we're going to be almost 3:30, we thank you for staying on.

We really appreciate your interest in the State Advisory Council report. We again want to say thank you to our presenters. We appreciate the fact that the 3 States were willing to share their story, share their information.

There's a rich amount of information in this report, because Ngozi and I are a tad partial. But we actually think that there's really a lot of information to be shared with the States. And so we thank you for joining this webinar and please let us know if you have additional questions. Have a great day.

>>Ngozi Onunaku: Thank you.

[END]