

NEBRASKA HEAD START-STATE COLLABORATION OFFICE



2011-2012 NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT



Survey Results, Trends, and Implications
August 2012

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Overview of Head Start in Nebraska.....	3

Needs Assessment Survey

Purpose of survey	4
Summary of Survey Instrument & Data Collection Process	4-5
Summary of Data Analysis Process.....	5
Overall Summary of Results.....	6

Detailed Needs Assessment Survey Results

Health Care	7-13
Services for Children Experiencing Homelessness	14-16
Welfare/Child Welfare	17-20
Family Literacy	21-25
Services for Children with Disabilities	26-31
Community Services	32-36
Education (School Readiness, Head Start—Pre-K Partnership Development)	37-40
Child Care	41-44
Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12	45-49
Professional Development	50-55
Early Childhood Systems	56-57
Appendix A: Survey Comments	58-65
Appendix B: Survey Participants.....	66

Introduction

Head Start is a federally funded program that provides comprehensive child development services to low income families and their children. Since its inception in 1965, Head Start has provided families with support and resources that address their children’s health, nutritional, social, and educational needs. The primary focus of Head Start is to increase school readiness of young children aged three to five. In 1994, Early Head Start was created to provide “Head Start” type services to pregnant woman, children age birth up to age three and their families. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services is the federal agency that houses the Office of Head Start. The Office of Head Start awards grants directly to public/non-public agencies, private organizations, school districts and Indian Tribes to provide Head Start and Early Head Start services. Head Start and Early Head Start services in Nebraska are delivered in a variety of ways, including:

1. Center Based programming
2. Home Based services
3. Collaboration programming with school districts and Educational Service Units (ESU)
4. Full day/part day enrollment
5. Combination of home based and center based programs
6. Full day/full year programs

Overview of Head Start in Nebraska

There are 15 Region VII grantees in Nebraska that provide Head Start and/or Early Head Start services. In addition, there are three American Indian, one Migrant/Seasonal and three delegate programs. Nebraska grantees and delegates consist of community action agencies, school systems, non-profit agencies and tribal governments.



Nebraska Head Start State Collaboration Office NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY RESULTS

This report presents the findings of a Needs Assessment survey of Nebraska Head Start staff and directors conducted by the Nebraska Head Start State Collaboration Office (HSSCO). The survey was conducted in March of 2012. The purpose of gathering the information was to identify state needs in the areas of coordination, collaboration alignment of services, and alignment of curricula. The survey also serves the purpose of informing the activities of the annually revised strategic plan for the Nebraska Head Start State Collaboration Office.

Purpose of Survey

The purpose of gathering needs assessment information is to identify state needs in the areas of coordination, collaboration alignment of services and curricula. The needs assessment survey also provides an opportunity for the Nebraska Head Start State Collaboration Office to complete necessary revisions of its strategic plan based on data gathered in the study. In addition, the survey was conducted as required in Section 642B of the *Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, Public Law 110-134*.

Summary of Survey Instrument & Data Collection Process

Data was collected specific to the Needs Assessment through an online survey. The survey used was based on a template developed by a National Sub-Committee of Head Start State Collaboration Directors that was designed around identified federal priority areas with a focus on collaboration and coordination activities. The online survey system, Survey Monkey, was used. Information about the survey was distributed to all grantees and delegates. Sixteen Head Start/Early Head Start grantee and delegates submitted survey responses by the March 2012 deadline.

This needs assessment survey questionnaire was organized around the eight national priority areas for the HSSCOs. These priority areas are:

- Health Services
- Services for Children Experiencing Homelessness
- Welfare/Child Welfare
- Family Literacy
- Services for Children with Disabilities
- Community Services
- Education (School Readiness, Head Start—Pre-K Partnership Development)
- Child Care

In addition, sections were included to cover these additional Federal Goals:

- Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12
- Professional Development
- Early Childhood Systems

The survey included three parts for each of the content areas indicated above.

Part 1 asks the survey respondents to rate the extent of their involvement with various service providers/organizations related to the content area. This part uses the following 4-point Likert scale and definitions to reflect progress in relationship-building at this point in time:

No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	You have little to no contact with each other (i.e., you do not: make/receive referrals, work together on projects/activities, share information, etc.)
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	You exchange information . This includes making and receiving referrals, even when you serve the same families.
Coordination (work together)	You work together on projects or activities . Examples: parents from the service providers’ agency are invited to your parent education night; the service provider offers health screenings for the children at your site.
Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	You share resources and/or have formal, written agreements . Examples: co-funded staff or building costs; joint grant funding for a new initiative; an MOU on transition, etc.

Part 2 asks the survey respondents to indicate the level of difficulty their program has had engaging in each of a variety of activities and partnerships. A 4-point scale of difficulty is provided, ranging from “Not At All Difficult” to “Extremely Difficult,” as shown below. The purpose of this part is to assist in identifying challenges they may be experiencing in building successful partnerships at the local and state levels to support the delivery of quality education and comprehensive services to children and families.

Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
-----------------------------	---------------------------	------------------	----------------------------

Part 3 includes two open-ended questions at the end of each section of the survey instrument. The first will give each respondent the opportunity to document any remaining concerns that were not covered in the survey. The second question gives respondents the opportunity to document what is working well in each of their respective programs, and to indicate if any of these successful strategies/activities may be helpful to other programs.

Summary of Data Analysis Process

When the online survey closed, raw data was compiled, analyzed, and summarized by Kristin Saathoff, a Research Specialist from the Center on Children, Families, and the Law at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This summary report shows the percentages of responses for each priority area or federal goal within the context of the involvement with different organizations, providers, and services (rated from *no working relationship* to *collaboration*) and difficulty engaging in different activities or services (rated from *not at all difficult* to *extremely difficult*); for comparison, these percentages are reported for both the 2008 and 2012 needs assessment surveys.

Overall Summary of Results

The content of this report contains the detailed results of the needs assessment survey. However, analysis of the data overall revealed that the following areas stood out as areas of need within the state of Nebraska.

Areas of Collaboration Needs that will Guide Collaborative Planning Efforts

These areas will guide collaborative planning with key stakeholders in the following years.

- Mental health services;
- Tribal agencies (Note: This will be explored further with the AIAN programs and those grantees that are proximally closer or overlap to the AIAN populations on reservations and/or that have high mobility of tribal children/families);
- Early childhood systems (Note: The focus of efforts surrounding early childhood systems should be on the meaning and scope of what early childhood systems is, as many agencies were unclear as to what it all involves).

In addition, several areas of difficulty surfaced after analyzing the needs assessment data, which should also be areas of focus in the following years:

- Difficulties reported in the priority areas of child care and professional development (see detailed report for more information);
- Partnering with other agencies;
- Communication and exchanging of information with other agencies.

Priority Area: Health Services

Respondents were asked to rate and describe their involvement during the past 12 months with health care providers/entities that may be involved with families who receive Head Start services. A review of this data indicates a fairly high percentage of respondents (ranges from 63% to 100%) reported cooperation, coordination, or collaboration with most health care providers and organizations. However, over 40% of the respondents reported having *no working relationship* with services surrounding mental health (e.g., state agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment services and local/tribal agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment).

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with engaging in many of the health service related activities and partnerships. For example, over 80% of respondents reported having some level of difficulty assisting parents to communicate effectively with medical and dental providers and assisting families to get transportation to appointments.

Medical home providers

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	45	44
Coordination (work together)	30	37
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	25	19

Difficulties with medical home providers

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Linking children to medical homes

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	60	56
Somewhat Difficult	40	44
Difficult	0	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Priority Area: Health Services

Difficulties with medical home providers continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Partnering with medical professionals on health-related issues

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	70	37
Somewhat Difficult	25	44
Difficult	5	19
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Getting children enrolled in CHIP or Medicaid

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	45	25
Somewhat Difficult	50	56
Difficult	5	19
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Arranging coordinated services for children with special health care needs

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	25	31
Somewhat Difficult	65	63
Difficult	10	6
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Dental home providers for treatment and care

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	35	31
Coordination (work together)	45	38
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	20	31

Priority Area: Health Services

Difficulties with dental home providers

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Linking children to dental homes that serve young children

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	35	37
Somewhat Difficult	30	44
Difficult	25	19
Extremely Difficult	10	0

Partnering with oral health professionals on oral-health related issues (e.g., hygiene, education, etc.)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	55	44
Somewhat Difficult	20	56
Difficult	25	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

State agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	40	44
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	40	31
Coordination (work together)	20	19
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	0	6

Local/Tribal agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	47
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	30	13
Coordination (work together)	25	13
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	45	27

Priority Area: Health Services

Agencies/programs that conduct mental health screenings

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	10	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	30	33
Coordination (work together)	20	27
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	40	40

WIC (Women, Infants Children)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	20	33
Coordination (work together)	25	20
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	55	47

Other nutrition services

(e.g., cooperative extension programs, university projects on nutrition, USDA, etc.)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	15	6
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	25	13
Coordination (work together)	35	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	25	56

Children's health education providers

(e.g., resource & referral, other community-based training providers)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	40	56
Coordination (work together)	45	38
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	15	6

Priority Area: Health Services

Parent health education providers

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	15	6
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	40	50
Coordination (work together)	40	38
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	6

Home-visiting programs and services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	5	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	50	12
Coordination (work together)	25	50
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	20	19

Community/Tribal Health Centers

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	10	37
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	55	25
Coordination (work together)	20	13
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	15	25

Public health services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	26	37
Coordination (work together)	37	44
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	37	19

Priority Area: Health Services

Difficulties with public health services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Getting full representation and active commitment on your Health Advisory Committee

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	55	44
Somewhat Difficult	35	38
Difficult	5	12
Extremely Difficult	5	6

Programs/services related to children's physical fitness and obesity prevention

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	30	25
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	40	25
Coordination (work together)	20	27
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	10	13

General Difficulties with Health Services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Assisting parents to communicate effectively with medical/dental providers

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	10	19
Somewhat Difficult	65	56
Difficult	25	19
Extremely Difficult	0	6

Assisting families to get transportation to appointments

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	25	19
Somewhat Difficult	45	37
Difficult	25	44
Extremely Difficult	5	0

Priority Area: Health Services

General Difficulties with Health Services Continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Obtaining data/information on children/families served jointly by Head Start and other agencies re: health care (e.g., lead screening, nutrition reports, home-visit reports, etc.)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	42	31
Somewhat Difficult	58	56
Difficult	0	13
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Exchanging information on roles and resources with medical, dental and other providers/ organizations regarding health care

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	37	31
Somewhat Difficult	58	50
Difficult	0	19
Extremely Difficult	5	0

Priority Area: Services for Children Experiencing Homelessness

Respondents were asked to rate and describe the extent of involvement regarding services for children experiencing homelessness during the past 12 months. A review of this data indicates over 50% of respondents reported *no working relationship* with the Local McKinney-Vento liaison and over 70% reported *no working relationship* with the school district Title I Director.

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with engaging community partners in conducting staff training and planning activities and developing and implementing family outreach and support efforts under McKinney-Vento and transition planning.

Local McKinney-Vento liaison (public school, community services)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	85	50
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	5	25
Coordination (work together)	10	12.5
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	0	12.5

Local housing agencies and planning groups serving families experiencing homelessness (e.g., shelters, Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness committees)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	25	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	55	56
Coordination (work together)	15	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	0

Priority Area: Services for Children Experiencing Homelessness

School district Title I Director

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012*
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	72	72
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	11	14
Coordination (work together)	11	14
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	6	0

* Respondents only answered this question in the 2012 survey if Title I funds were being used to support early care and education programs for children experiencing homelessness
 (Note: 2008 = 18 people answered this question; 2012 = 7 people answered this question)

General Difficulties with Homelessness

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children experiencing homelessness are identified and prioritized for enrollment

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	65	80
Somewhat Difficult	15	13
Difficult	20	7
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Allowing families of children experiencing homelessness to apply to, enroll in and attend Head Start while required documents are obtained within a reasonable time frame

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	55	80
Somewhat Difficult	35	13
Difficult	10	7
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Priority Area: Services for Children Experiencing Homelessness

General Difficulties with Homelessness Continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Obtaining sufficient data on the needs of homeless children to inform the program's annual community assessment

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	30	67
Somewhat Difficult	45	27
Difficult	20	6
Extremely Difficult	5	0

Engaging community partners, including the local McKinney-Vento Homeless Liaison, in conducting staff cross training and planning activities

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	5	33
Somewhat Difficult	45	20
Difficult	25	27
Extremely Difficult	25	20

In coordination with LEA, developing and implementing family outreach and support efforts under McKinney-Vento and transition planning for children experiencing homelessness

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	47	34
Somewhat Difficult	29	40
Difficult	24	13
Extremely Difficult	0	13

Priority Area: Welfare and Child Welfare

Respondents were asked to rate and describe the extent of involvement specific to welfare and child welfare services specific to Head Start children and families during the past 12 months. A review of this data indicates the two biggest problematic areas regarding collaboration in this area were with economic and community development councils (with almost 63% indicating *no working relationship*) and the State Children’s Trust agency (with over 70% of respondents indicating *no working relationship*).

A review of this data indicates a fairly high percentage of respondents (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with obtaining information and data for community assessment and planning, facilitating shared training and technical assistance opportunities, getting involved in state level planning and policy development, and exchanging information on roles and resources with other service providers regarding family/child assistance services.

Local Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Services (TANF)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	50	62.5
Coordination (work together)	45	37.5
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	0

Difficulties with TANF

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Working together with TANF, Employment and Training, and related support services to recruit families

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	45	63
Somewhat Difficult	55	25
Difficult	0	6
Extremely Difficult	0	6

Priority Area: Welfare and Child Welfare

Employment & Training and Labor services agencies

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	15	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	45	56
Coordination (work together)	35	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	0

Economic and Community Development Councils

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	42	62.5
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	32	25
Coordination (work together)	21	12.5
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	0

Local/County Child Welfare agency (e.g., child protective services)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	50
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	44
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	6

State Child Welfare Agency

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	31
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	58	63
Coordination (work together)	37	6
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	0

Priority Area: Welfare and Child Welfare

State Children's Trust Agency

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	78	71
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	5	22
Coordination (work together)	17	7
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	0	0

Services and networks supporting foster and adoptive families

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	16	12
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	47	69
Coordination (work together)	37	19
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	0	0

General Difficulties with Welfare and Child Welfare

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Obtaining information and data for community assessment and planning

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	30	44
Somewhat Difficult	60	50
Difficult	10	6
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children in the child welfare system are prioritized for enrollment

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	95	94
Somewhat Difficult	5	6
Difficult	0	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Priority Area: Welfare and Child Welfare

General Difficulties with Welfare and Child Welfare Continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Facilitating shared training and technical assistance opportunities

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	20	38
Somewhat Difficult	65	44
Difficult	5	12
Extremely Difficult	10	6

Getting involved in state level planning and policy development

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	30	22
Somewhat Difficult	25	50
Difficult	35	7
Extremely Difficult	10	21

Exchanging information on roles & resources with other service providers regarding family/child assistance services

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	45	50
Somewhat Difficult	50	50
Difficult	5	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Priority Area: Family Literacy

Respondents were asked to summarize and rate the extent of involvement with service providers and organizations specific to family literacy activities during the past 12 months. A review of this data indicates a fairly high percentage of respondents (ranges from 81% to 100%) reported cooperation, coordination, or collaboration with most family literacy providers and organizations. However, over 40% of respondents reported having *no working relationship* with school libraries, museums, reading readiness programs, and higher education programs/services/resources related to family literacy (e.g., grant projects, student interns, cross-training, etc.).

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with establishing linkages/partnerships with key literacy providers (e.g., libraries, literacy council foundations, community colleges, etc.), securing family participation in family literacy services, and exchanging information with other providers and organizations regarding roles and resources related to family literacy.

State or local family literacy programs

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	56
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

Employment and Training programs

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	25	13
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	50	56
Coordination (work together)	20	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	6

Priority Area: Family Literacy

Adult Education

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	10	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	53	69
Coordination (work together)	32	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	6

English Language Learner programs & services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	25	13
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	50	56
Coordination (work together)	15	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	10	6

Services to promote parent/child literacy interactions

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	15	6
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	40	57
Coordination (work together)	40	31
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	6

Parent education programs/services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	20	6
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	35	44
Coordination (work together)	40	50
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	0

Priority Area: Family Literacy

Public libraries

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	15	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	30	62.5
Coordination (work together)	45	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	10	12.5

School libraries

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	40	50
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	25	19
Coordination (work together)	25	31
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	10	0

Public/private sources that provide book donations or funding for books

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	20	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	20	37.5
Coordination (work together)	45	37.5
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	15	6

Museums

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	55	44
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	25	25
Coordination (work together)	15	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	6

Priority Area: Family Literacy

Reading Readiness programs

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	47	47
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	16	33
Coordination (work together)	26	20
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	11	0

Higher education programs/services/resources related to family literacy (e.g., grant projects, student interns, cross-training, etc.)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	50	44
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	15	19
Coordination (work together)	25	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	10	12

Providers of services for children and families who are English language learners (ELL)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	20	12.5
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	45	56
Coordination (work together)	25	19
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	10	12.5

General Difficulties with Family Literacy

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Incorporating family literacy into your program policies and practices

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	68	94
Somewhat Difficult	21	6
Difficult	11	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Priority Area: Family Literacy

General Difficulties with Family Literacy

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Educating others (e.g., parents, the community) about the importance of family literacy

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	37	75
Somewhat Difficult	47	25
Difficult	16	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Establishing linkages/partnerships with key literacy providers (libraries, literacy council, foundations, community colleges)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	37	37.5
Somewhat Difficult	37	62.5
Difficult	21	0
Extremely Difficult	5	0

Securing family participation in family literacy services, as available

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	38
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	56
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	6
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	0

Exchanging information with other providers/organizations regarding roles and resources related to family literacy

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	42	50
Somewhat Difficult	37	37.5
Difficult	21	12.5
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Priority Area: Services for Children with Disabilities

Respondents were asked to summarize and rate the extent of their involvement with service providers and organizations specific to providing services for children with disabilities during the past 12 months. A review of this data indicates a fairly high percentage of respondents (ranges from 67% to 94%) reported cooperation, coordination, or collaboration with most providers or organizations related to services for children with disabilities. However, 60% of respondents indicated *no working relationship* with University and Community college programs/services related to children with disabilities (e.g., University Centers for Excellence on Disability, etc.). Almost 87% reported *no working relationship* with a tribal education agency. Finally, 100% of the respondents reported *no working relationship* with the Bureau of Indian Education FACE program.

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with obtaining timely Part C and Part B/619 evaluations of children and applying for SSI or waiver programs.

State Lead Agency for Part B/619 (preschool special education)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	16	31
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	42	25
Coordination (work together)	10	19
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	32	25

Local Part B/619 (preschool special education) providers

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	11	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	39	12
Coordination (work together)	6	6
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	44	63

Priority Area: Services for Children with Disabilities

Difficulties with Part B/619

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Obtaining timely Part B/619 (preschool special education) evaluations of children

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	46
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	39
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	15
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	0

Coordinating services with Part B/619 providers

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	66	64
Somewhat Difficult	27	36
Difficult	7	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

State Education Agency—other programs/services (e.g., Section 504 of Rehabilitation Act, state improvement grants, state Response to Intervention)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	21	33
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	26	47
Coordination (work together)	37	13
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	16	7

Tribal Education Agency

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	87
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	13
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	0
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

Priority Area: Services for Children with Disabilities

Bureau of Indian Education FACE program

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	100
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	0
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	0
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

State Lead Agency for Part C (early intervention)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	15	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	15	25
Coordination (work together)	35	19
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	35	37

Local Part C providers (early intervention)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	5	6
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	11	6
Coordination (work together)	16	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	68	63

Difficulties with Part C

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Obtaining timely Part C (early intervention) evaluations of children (i.e., within 60 days of when referral is made)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	50
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	37.5
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	12.5
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	0

Priority Area: Services for Children with Disabilities

Difficulties with Part C continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Coordinating services with Part C providers

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	79	69
Somewhat Difficult	16	31
Difficult	5	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Supporting the referral process to Part C providers/agencies for children identified under CAPTA (Child Abuse Prevention & Treatment Act)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	73
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	27
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	0
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	0

Other Federally funded programs for families of children with disabilities (e.g., Parent Training & Information Center, Family Voices, Maternal and Child Health, Protection & Advocacy agency, Special Medical Services, etc.)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	26	13
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	37	56
Coordination (work together)	21	31
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	16	0

Priority Area: Services for Children with Disabilities

Other State-funded programs for children with disabilities and their families (e.g., developmental services agencies)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	26	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	32	56
Coordination (work together)	26	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	16	0

University/community college programs/services related to children with disabilities (e.g., University Centers for Excellence on Disability/others)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	50	60
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	44	26
Coordination (work together)	0	7
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	6	7

Non-Head Start councils, committees or work groups that address policy/program issues regarding children with disabilities (e.g., State /Local Interagency Coordinating Council, preschool special education work/advisory group)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	21	13
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	21	31
Coordination (work together)	42	50
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	16	6

Priority Area: Services for Children with Disabilities

General Difficulties with Services for Children with Disabilities

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Having HS/EHS staff attend IEP or IFSP meetings

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	79	87.5
Somewhat Difficult	11	12.5
Difficult	5	0
Extremely Difficult	5	0

Sharing data/information on jointly served children (assessments, outcomes, etc.)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	53	67.5
Somewhat Difficult	37	37.5
Difficult	10	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding services for children with disabilities and their families

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	58	69
Somewhat Difficult	32	31
Difficult	10	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Applying for SSI and/or Waiver Programs (for children and families with disabilities)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	33
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	47
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	20
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	0

Priority Area: Community Services

Respondents were asked to summarize and rate the extent of their involvement with community service organizations that may be involved with families. Examples of such organizations include law enforcement, providers of substance abuse prevention/treatment services, child abuse prevention/treatment and domestic violence prevention/treatment services, etc. A review of this data indicates a fairly high percentage of respondents (ranges from 82%-100%) reported cooperation, coordination, or collaboration with almost all of the community service related providers and organizations. However, almost 44% of respondents did report *no working relationship* with providers of services to military families.

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with establishing linkages/partnerships with both public resources and private resources of prevention/treatment services and providers of services to military families, obtaining in-kind community services for children and families, and sharing data and information on children and families served jointly by HS/EHS and other agencies.

Law Enforcement

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	15	12
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	55	44
Coordination (work together)	30	44
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	0	0

Difficulties with Law Enforcement

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Establishing linkages/partnerships with law enforcement agencies

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	65	60
Somewhat Difficult	20	33
Difficult	10	7
Extremely Difficult	5	0

Priority Area: Community Services

Providers of substance abuse prevention/treatment services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	10	
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	70	19
Coordination (work together)	20	62
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	0	19

Providers of child abuse prevention/treatment services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	55	38
Coordination (work together)	35	56
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	10	6

Providers of domestic violence prevention/treatment services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	55	50
Coordination (work together)	45	44
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	0	6

Private resources geared toward prevention/intervention (e.g., faith-based, business, foundations, shelters, etc.)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	10	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	70	50
Coordination (work together)	15	31
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	5	0

Priority Area: Community Services

Difficulties with private resources

(% of respondents choosing each option)

**Establishing linkages/partnerships with private resources
(e.g., faith-based, foundations, business) regarding prevention/treatment services**

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	55	40
Somewhat Difficult	35	53
Difficult	10	7
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Providers of emergency services

(e.g., Red Cross, state agency responsible for large-scale emergency plans)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	20	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	55	56
Coordination (work together)	25	19
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	0	6

Providers of services to military families

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	56
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	31
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	13
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

Priority Area: Community Services

Difficulties with services to military families

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Establishing linkages/partnerships with providers of services to military families

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	23
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	69
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	8
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	0

General Difficulties with Community Services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Establishing linkages/partnerships with public resources (state, county, city, etc.) regarding prevention/treatment services

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	55	40
Somewhat Difficult	35	60
Difficult	10	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Partnering with service providers on outreach activities for eligible families

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	45	60
Somewhat Difficult	45	40
Difficult	5	0
Extremely Difficult	5	0

Obtaining in-kind community services for the children/families in your program

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	40	40
Somewhat Difficult	30	33
Difficult	15	7
Extremely Difficult	15	20

Priority Area: Community Services

General Difficulties with Community Services Continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Sharing data/information on children/families served jointly by HS/EHS and other agencies regarding prevention/treatment services

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	25	47
Somewhat Difficult	70	53
Difficult	5	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding community services

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	30	62.5
Somewhat Difficult	65	37.5
Difficult	5	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Priority Area: Education

Respondents were asked to summarize the extent of involvement with education agencies over the last 12 months. A review of this data indicates a fairly high percentage of respondents (ranges from 87%) reported cooperation, coordination, or collaboration with a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with appropriate local entity responsible for managing publicly funded preschool programs. Only 13% reported *no working relationship* regarding the MOU.

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with engaging in activities and partnerships concerning educational activities, curricular objectives and instructions (64% reporting some level of difficulty); services areas (64% reporting some level of difficulty); staff training (86% reporting some level of difficulty); joint/shared technical assistance (50% reporting some level of difficulty); provision of services to meet needs of working parents (50% reporting some level of difficulty); provision and use of facilities, transportation, etc. (57% reporting some level of difficulty); developing MOUs with publicly funded preschool programs (62% reporting some level of difficulty); and other elements mutually agreed to by the parties to the MOU (62% reporting some level of difficulty). However, it should be noted that the majority of respondents indicated that engaging in these activities were *somewhat difficult*, rather than *difficult* or *extremely difficult*.

**Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
with the appropriate local entity responsible for managing PUBLICLY FUNDED
PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS in the service area of your agency, which includes plans to
coordinate activities, as described in 642(e) (5)(A)(i)(ii) (I-X), a**

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	11	13
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	11	13
Coordination (work together)	15	0
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	63	74

Priority Area: Education

General Difficulties with Education

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Educational activities, curricular objectives and instruction

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	55	36
Somewhat Difficult	28	57
Difficult	17	0
Extremely Difficult	0	7

Information, dissemination and access for families contacting Head Start or other preschool program

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	61	71
Somewhat Difficult	22	29
Difficult	17	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Selection priorities for eligible children served

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	39	64
Somewhat Difficult	44	36
Difficult	17	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Service areas

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	39	43
Somewhat Difficult	44	57
Difficult	17	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Priority Area: Education

General Difficulties with Education Continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Staff training, including opportunities for joint staff training

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	50	14
Somewhat Difficult	28	79
Difficult	22	7
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Joint/shared technical assistance (e.g., on mutual needs; to develop partnership agreements)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	33	50
Somewhat Difficult	45	43
Difficult	22	7
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Provision of services to meet needs of working parents, as applicable

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	22	50
Somewhat Difficult	56	50
Difficult	22	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Communications and parent outreach for transition to kindergarten

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	67	57
Somewhat Difficult	28	43
Difficult	5	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Priority Area: Education

General Difficulties with Education Continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Provision and use of facilities, transportation, etc.

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	50	43
Somewhat Difficult	33	50
Difficult	17	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Developing MOUs with publicly funded pre-school programs

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	38
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	54
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	8
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	0

Other elements mutually agreed to by the parties to the MOU

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	71	38
Somewhat Difficult	17	46
Difficult	12	8
Extremely Difficult	0	8

Priority Area: Child Care

Respondents were asked to rate and summarize the extent of involvement with different service providers specific to child care during the past 12 months. A review of this data indicates a fairly high percentage of respondents (ranges from 69%-100%) reported cooperation, coordination, or collaboration with most child care providers and organizations. However, 75% of respondents reported *no working relationship* with tribal child care providers. In addition, 40% of respondents reported *no working relationship* with state or regional policy/planning committees that address child care issues.

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with all of the areas asked about within the child care section of the survey. This included establishing linkages/partnerships with child care providers (53% reporting difficulty); assisting families to access full day, full year services (69% reporting difficulty); having the capacity to blend or braid HS and child care funds to provide full day, full year services (80% reporting difficulty); aligning policies and practices with other providers (87% reporting difficulty); sharing data and information on children that are jointly served (67% reporting difficulty); and exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers and organizations regarding child care and community needs assessment (56% reporting difficulty). However, it should be noted that the majority of respondents indicated that engaging in these activities were *somewhat difficult*, rather than *difficult* or *extremely difficult*.

State agency for Child Care

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	25	31
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	25	25
Coordination (work together)	20	38
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	30	6

Tribal Child Care*

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	75
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	0
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

* Note: Only 8 respondents answered this question in the 2012 survey

Priority Area: Child Care

Child Care Resource & Referral agencies

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	6
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	37.5	69
Coordination (work together)	37.5	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	25	0

Local child care programs to full day, full year services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	26	19
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	26	44
Coordination (work together)	32	31
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	16	6

Difficulties with local child care programs to full day, full year services

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Assisting families to access full day, full year services

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	20	31
Somewhat Difficult	65	50
Difficult	10	19
Extremely Difficult	5	0

Capacity to blend or braid, HS and child care funds to provide full day, full year services

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	20
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	47
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	27
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	6

Priority Area: Child Care

State or regional policy/planning committees that address child care issues

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	25	40
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	40	46
Coordination (work together)	15	7
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	20	7

Difficulties with state or regional policy/planning committees

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Sharing data/information on children that are jointly served (assessments, outcomes, etc.)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	35	34
Somewhat Difficult	35	53
Difficult	20	13
Extremely Difficult	10	0

Higher education programs/services/resources related to child care (e.g., lab schools, student interns, cross-training)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	30	25
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	35	37.5
Coordination (work together)	15	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	20	12.5

Priority Area: Child Care

General Difficulties with Child Care

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Establishing linkages/partnerships with child care providers

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	35	47
Somewhat Difficult	50	53
Difficult	5	0
Extremely Difficult	10	0

Aligning policies and practices with other service providers

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	0	14
Somewhat Difficult	58	53
Difficult	21	20
Extremely Difficult	21	13

Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding child care and community needs assessment

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	20	44
Somewhat Difficult	70	44
Difficult	5	6
Extremely Difficult	5	6

Federal Goal: Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12

Respondents were asked to rate and summarize the extent of involvement with head start transition and alignment with K-12 during the past 12 months. A review of this data indicates that 100% of the respondents reported having some level of involvement (cooperation, coordination, or collaboration) with local education agencies (LEAs) regarding transition from head start to kindergarten, with 84% of the respondents indicating the highest level of involvement (collaboration).

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with several of the activities or partnerships related to head start transition and alignment with K-12. These include ongoing communication with LEAs to facilitate coordination of programs (62% indicating some level of difficulty); establishing and implementing comprehensive transition policies and procedures with LEAs (69% indicating some level of difficulty); aligning LEA and HS curricula and assessments with the Head Start Child Outcomes Framework (54% indicating some level of difficulty); coordinating transportation and other support services with LEAs for children and families (54% and 62% indicating some level of difficulty, respectively); conducting joint outreach to parents and LEA to discuss needs of children entering kindergarten (54% indicating some level of difficulty); exchanging information with LEAs on roles, resources, and regulations (69% indicating some level of difficulty); and organizing and participating in joint training (54% indicating some level of difficulty). However, it should be noted that the majority of respondents indicated that engaging in these activities were *somewhat difficult*, rather than *difficult* or *extremely difficult*.

Relationship with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) regarding transition from Head Start to kindergarten

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	11	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	26	8
Coordination (work together)	26	8
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	37	84

Federal Goal: Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12

General Difficulties with Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Coordinating with LEAs to implement systematic procedures for transferring Head Start program records to school

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	66	77
Somewhat Difficult	22	15
Difficult	6	8
Extremely Difficult	6	0

Ongoing communication with LEAs to facilitate coordination of programs (including teachers, social workers, McKinney Vento liaisons, etc.)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	50	39
Somewhat Difficult	44	46
Difficult	0	15
Extremely Difficult	6	0

Establishing and implementing comprehensive transition policies and procedures with LEAs

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	50	31
Somewhat Difficult	33	61
Difficult	17	8
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Linking LEA and Head Start services relating to language, numeracy and literacy

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	56	54
Somewhat Difficult	44	31
Difficult	0	15
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Federal Goal: Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12

General Difficulties with Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12 Continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Aligning LEA and Head Start curricula and assessments with Head Start Child Outcomes Framework

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	50	46
Somewhat Difficult	33	54
Difficult	17	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Aligning Head Start curricula with state Early Learning Standards

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	61	77
Somewhat Difficult	22	23
Difficult	17	0
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Partnering with LEAs and parents to assist individual children/families to transition to school, including review of portfolio/records

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	67	54
Somewhat Difficult	22	38
Difficult	11	8
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Coordinating transportation with LEAs

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	0	46
Somewhat Difficult	0	38
Difficult	100*	8
Extremely Difficult	0	8

* Note: Only 1 respondent answered this question in the 2008 survey

Federal Goal: Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12

General Difficulties with Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12 Continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Coordinating shared use of facilities with LEAs

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	50	69
Somewhat Difficult	39	23
Difficult	0	8
Extremely Difficult	11	0

Coordinating with LEAs regarding other support services for children and families

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	50	38
Somewhat Difficult	33	54
Difficult	11	8
Extremely Difficult	6	0

Conducting joint outreach to parents and LEA to discuss needs of children entering kindergarten

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	67	46
Somewhat Difficult	22	39
Difficult	11	15
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Establish policies and procedures that support children's transition to school that includes engagement with LEA

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	67	54
Somewhat Difficult	33	38
Difficult	0	8
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Federal Goal: Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12

General Difficulties with Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12 Continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Helping parents of limited English proficient children understand instructional and other information and services provided by the receiving school

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	50	54
Somewhat Difficult	33	23
Difficult	11	23
Extremely Difficult	6	0

Exchanging information with LEAs on roles, resources and regulations

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	61	31
Somewhat Difficult	33	54
Difficult	6	15
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Aligning curricula and assessment practices with LEAs

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	39	54
Somewhat Difficult	39	31
Difficult	22	15
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Organizing and participating in joint training, including transition-related training for school staff and Head Start staff

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	33	46
Somewhat Difficult	44	46
Difficult	0	8
Extremely Difficult	22	0

Federal Goal: Professional Development

In 2008, survey questions were developed that asked respondents about their involvement with professional development related activities. A review of this data indicates a fairly high percentage of respondents (ranges from 67%-100%) reported cooperation, coordination, or collaboration with many of the professional development related activities and providers. However, respondents reported *no working relationship* for several activities including cultural and linguistic responsiveness (50% reported *no working relationship*), parent, family, and community engagement (44% reported *no working relationship*), quality teaching and learning (50% reported *no working relationship*), program management and fiscal operations (44% reported *no working relationship*), and the center on health (56% reported *no working relationship*).

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with transferring credits between public institutions of learning (73% reporting some level of difficulty), accessing T & TA opportunities in the community (56% reporting some level of difficulty), accessing scholarships and other financial support for professional development activities (75% reporting some level of difficulty), having time to release staff for professional development activities (75% reporting some level of difficulty; 25% reporting this to be *extremely difficult*), and exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers and organizations regarding professional development (44% reporting some level of difficulty). However, it should be noted that the majority of respondents indicated that engaging in these activities were *somewhat difficult*, rather than *difficult* or *extremely difficult*.

Institutions of Higher Education (4 year)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	10	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	50	47
Coordination (work together)	25	33
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	15	20

Institutions of Higher Education (less than 4 year)(e.g., community colleges)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	10	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	35	19
Coordination (work together)	25	50
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	30	31

Federal Goal: Professional Development

Online courses and programs

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	47	6
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	16	31
Coordination (work together)	26	57
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	11	6

Difficulties with online courses and programs

(% of respondents choosing each option)

**Accessing online professional development opportunities
(e.g., availability of equipment, internet connection, etc.)**

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	25	75
Somewhat Difficult	40	19
Difficult	25	6
Extremely Difficult	10	0

Child Care Resource & Referral Network

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	50	20
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	35	47
Coordination (work together)	15	33
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	0	0

Head Start State T & TA Network

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	0	6
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	10	6
Coordination (work together)	65	57
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	25	31

Federal Goal: Professional Development

Other T & TA networks (regional, state)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	15	12
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	20	19
Coordination (work together)	50	38
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	15	31

Service providers/organizations offering relevant training/TA cross-training opportunities

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	5	0
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	35	44
Coordination (work together)	40	50
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	20	6

Difficulties with service providers/organizations offering relevant training/TA cross-training opportunities

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding professional development

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	45	56
Somewhat Difficult	35	38
Difficult	15	6
Extremely Difficult	5	0

Federal Goal: Professional Development

Difficulties with service providers/organizations offering relevant training/TA cross-training opportunities continued

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Accessing T & TA opportunities in the community (including cross-training)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	42	44
Somewhat Difficult	37	37
Difficult	16	19
Extremely Difficult	5	0

National Centers: Cultural & Linguistic Responsiveness

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	50
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	37.5
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	12.5
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

National Centers: Parent, Family & Community Engagement

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	44
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	31
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

Federal Goal: Professional Development

National Centers: Quality Teaching & Learning

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	50
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	25
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	25
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

National Centers: Early Head Start National Resource Center

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	33
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	47
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	20
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

National Centers: Program Management & Fiscal Operations

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	44
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	31
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	19
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	6

National Centers: Center on Health

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	56
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	31
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	13
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

Federal Goal: Professional Development

General Difficulties with Professional Development

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Transferring credits between public institutions of learning

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	21	27
Somewhat Difficult	47	60
Difficult	32	13
Extremely Difficult	0	0

Accessing early childhood education degree programs in the community

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	20	63
Somewhat Difficult	55	19
Difficult	15	12
Extremely Difficult	10	6

Accessing scholarships and other financial support for professional development programs/activities (e.g., T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	15	25
Somewhat Difficult	25	62.5
Difficult	25	12.5
Extremely Difficult	35	0

Staff release time to attend professional development activities

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	30	25
Somewhat Difficult	25	31
Difficult	25	19
Extremely Difficult	20	25

Federal Goal: Early Childhood Systems

For the 2012 needs assessment survey, respondents were asked to rate and summarize the extent of involvement with different service providers specific to early childhood systems during the past 12 months. A review of this data indicates a fairly low percentage of cooperation, coordination, and collaboration with most of the early childhood systems providers and organizations. Specifically, 40% of respondents reported *no working relationship* with the State Advisory Council and State Early Learning Council and 47% of respondents reported *no working relationship* with state efforts to unify early childhood data systems.

Respondents reported high levels of difficulties (50% or more respondents indicating some level of difficulty) with exchanging information from and providing input to state advisory councils (60% reporting some level of difficulty) and participating in state efforts to unify early childhood data systems (53% reporting some level of difficulty).

It should be noted that during the conference call summarizing the results of the needs assessment survey, many of the agency directors were not clear on what was all included within "Early Childhood Systems." Therefore, the results of this section of the survey may be misleading. As a result of this misunderstanding, it will be the goal of HSSCO to clarify this area for HS/EHS agencies in the following years. In addition, the results for the questions surrounding the state Quality Rating & Improvement System (QRIS) were deleted, as Nebraska does not have a QRIS in place at this time.

SAC (State Advisory Council, State Early Learning Council)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	40
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	40
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	20
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

State Quality Rating & Improvement System (QRIS)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	N/A
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	N/A
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	N/A
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	N/A

Federal Goal: Early Childhood Systems

State efforts to unify early childhood data systems (e.g., child/family/ program assessment data)

(% of respondents choosing each option)

	2008	2012
No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Not in 2008 survey	46
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Not in 2008 survey	27
Coordination (work together)	Not in 2008 survey	27
Collaboration (share resources/formal agreements)	Not in 2008 survey	0

General Difficulties with Early Childhood Systems

(% of respondents choosing each option)

Exchanging information from and providing input to state advisory councils

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	40
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	47
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	0
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	13

Participating in state Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS)

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	N/A
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	N/A
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	N/A
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	N/A

Participating in state efforts to unify early childhood data systems

	2008	2012
Not at All Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	46
Somewhat Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	40
Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	7
Extremely Difficult	Not in 2008 survey	7

Appendix A: Survey Comments

Health Services

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding health care for the children and families in your program.

- Difficult finding dental care providers that provide services to children under the age of 3 and finding dental care providers that serve Medicaid clients
- Parent compliance to the Head Start requirements.
- Since we are in a rural, remote area, dental referrals for children who need surgery is sometimes hindered by distance, usually the only place is Sioux City, Iowa and Omaha.
- The time it takes to verify if a family has been accepted into state Department of Health and Services can take several months.
- Clear state guidelines on the EPSDT schedule. Physicians being clear on these expectations and completing all EPSDT requirements on well baby checks as well as documenting completion of these requirements in the child's record.
- Getting health and dental care for children without insurance and who don't qualify for Medicaid. More pediatric dentists in rural areas and more who will accept Medicaid.
- Parents don't understand the need to follow-up with Kid's Connection. Parents following through on visits to providers.
- Some medical providers continue to miss needed tests/screening when we send families to them.
- Very rural area. Limited providers.

What is working well in your efforts to address the health care needs of the children and families in your program? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- Have a vast amount of medical providers available in our community.
- Having nurses go into the homes and the teaching they do has really helped our families. The record-keeping we use (ex. well child checks/Immunization Prescreening clinics we have after enrollment for Head Start children)
- Partnering with our local pediatric dentist and his staff.
- Public dental clinic Dentist flying in Fluoride Treatments from a local partner
- Success with lead testing in the Omaha area and lead advocacy programs are available to families.
- We have a good working relationship with the dental clinic, they provide us with fluoride varnish up to 5x a year, they are really helpful getting our children referred out for services.
- We have a great Health Services Advisory Committee and great professionals that guide our program.
- We have an excellent working partnership with the Santee Health Clinic and I believe the clinic staff has a belief that children need to have health care and dental if they are to be successful in school.
- We have collaborated with Clinic with a Heart to provide blood lead testing using our equipment to enrolled children who still need this test.
- We provide the Health Care Institute to a select group of 100 families every year and have seen a vast improvement in their knowledge of health related issues and how to handle them and where to go for treatment more information and making better decision when then needing to use the health care system.

Services for Children Experiencing Homelessness

Comments regarding services for children experiencing homelessness.

- County does not have housing/transitional opportunities; homeless assess services in Iowa, which is just across the river.
- Many of our households have multiple families living in them, it's hard to get them to understand that they are considered homeless if they are living in someone's home.

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding services for children and families in your program experiencing homelessness.

- Keeping track of them as they are so mobile and don't necessarily know or share where they are going or when.
- Referring them to housing, we have a shortage of housing in our community, so there really is a waiting list everywhere.
- We have a continuum of services at The Salvation Army for homeless families and children. We use these resources frequently.
- Working on developing relationships with school liaison Limited low-income housing available

What is working well in your efforts to address the housing needs of the children and families in your program who are experiencing homelessness? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- Care Corps handles/helps families. They have in the past made referrals to Head Start. I have offered several times to give a mini-workshop for their staff on Head Start services but they have never followed up.
- Family goals
- Though we know there are likely more homeless children in need of our services, we have prioritized the enrollment of these children and are able to serve them and their families effectively.
- Work well with LEA's to provide services
- Work with local housing authority.

Welfare & Child Welfare

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding the welfare/child welfare (family/child assistance) needs of the children and families in your program.

- Assisting families with navigating the HHS system.
- CPS has been harder than normal work with in the last 6 months, I don't know why
- Guardianship issues.
- Western Nebraska limited resources

What is working well in your efforts to address the welfare/child welfare (family/child assistance) needs of children and families in your program? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- DHHS workers have heavy caseloads and the overall organization seems disorganized and sometimes there is no continuity across the state
- Employment and training, seems to be working very well. They send us a number of people, as well as voc. rehab.
- Existing resources collaborate together
- Families that need on-line assistance can be done at our office or through the TANF Office and the Santee Clinic and at the Social Service Program. All of the agencies also let families use the phone if calls need to made or sometimes parents do not understand the letters they receive and we help explain the information to them.
- Good partnerships/working relationships with local agencies.
- Other agencies will share information; CPS for example will come to the center and speak with staff but as far as actually working together on plans and outcomes we are not included.
- We have a staff presence on the Lancaster County Treatment Team, which is a highly effective way to tackle our most difficult family issues.

Family Literacy

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding family literacy services and resources.

- Lack of parent participation and resources to provide books for the home without using federal funds.
- Small rural communities limited availability
- Translating documents; getting all staff to take this on as one of our priorities.
- While it wouldn't be difficult for us to partner with local family literacy providers, we just don't do this currently.

What is working well in your efforts to address the literacy needs of the families in your program? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- Collaboration with the public libraries and the program submerges literacy into all areas of the curriculum.
- Offering parent education on Family Literacy; Offer funds to assist parents in obtaining GED; Complete a Home Assessment with each family enrolled in our program; Financial Literacy Survey is completed with each family to identify need
- Our literacy program/homework; Read-A-Thon; Dolly Pardon Imagination Station book club.

Services for Children with Disabilities

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding services for children with disabilities and their families.

- Making early intervention referrals is not difficult but when they do not qualify, finding other services can be a challenge.
- Some of the public schools in our service area are not providing much needed para-professionals in our classroom for children with IEPs. Our low cost per child funding does not allow for the much needed extra staff person to assist those children with one on one needs.
- Sometimes after IEP/IFSP are written the services and timelines aren't followed. The differences in the coaching model is not consistent across locations. Some confusion on sharing children on GOLD and different service providers entering different requirements.
- SSI and Waiver are just a lot of paperwork and time.
- We have difficulty with all aspects of the referral, evaluation, and service provision with the Omaha Public School District. Evaluations are not completed in the 45 day time period according to Rule 51 and frequently services are not implemented in a timely manner.

What is working well in your efforts to address the needs of children with disabilities in your program? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- Collaboration with ESU and the school districts for sped services has not been an issue.
- Excellent collaboration with all school districts in Sarpy County.
- Parent advocacy groups have been helpful to our program and families.
- Service providers and our staff do a nice job case coordinating and working on joint goals. Home visitors doing co-visits especially when there are safety concerns in the home or child abuse and neglect issues. The relationships between our teachers and home visitors with service providers are supportive and they communicate well.
- We currently have a full time special education early childhood teacher, and a full time speech and language pathologist provided by the LEA (Winnebago Public School)

Community Services

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding community services for the families in your program.

- Cross training between agencies.
- Mid Head Start has excellent community partnerships, as well as adequate non-federal (in kind) match.
- Rural areas do not offer services locally for families.
- Since we do not have contact with many of these providers, I did not respond to difficulty questions.

What is working well in your efforts to address the community services needs of the families in your program? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- Excellent relationships with a wide variety of agencies.
- Invite other agencies to your program to provide training on what is offered from their agency
- Inviting community providers to present during pre-service training has been helpful and many then go on to serve on the Policy Council.
- Relationship with CPS

Education

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding partnership development with Local Educational Agencies in your service areas.

- At time, we both look at situations from our own perspectives and fail to take into account how the other will be affected by a decision we are about to make. Sometimes, it seems like the public schools fail to remember that the children we serve are their children. Our children will be transitioning into their schools. So it is in everyone's best interest to ensure all the children arrive at kindergarten with the skills to ensure they will be successful.
- Funding for Head Start and each local school district varies from year to year. When the school has a new Supt. or Elementary Principal, the team spends MORE hours discussing Pre-K partnerships goals/philosophy and vision. Time is a major factor for both parties.
- Head Start staff monitoring classrooms that are staffed with Public School staff can be a challenging situation. We are also experiencing some challenges with families who are income eligible for Head Start not wanting to be in Head Start because of the additional paperwork and services. They prefer to be enrolled as a public school student because they do not want to complete the home visits.
- We are a stand-alone EHS program so questions above do not apply to us.
- We have a collaboration with several school districts. Most of the school districts are very cooperative in all regards to the MOU. We have a good working relationship with these school districts. However, we have difficulties in all areas within the MO with the Omaha Public School District.
- We have a good working relationship with our LEA. They usually provide our program with what we need.
- We have MOUs with all of our LEA/s in our service area. My take on the levels are unless there has never been any concern I put somewhat difficult.

What is working well in your efforts to develop partnerships with LEAs managing Pre-K programs in your service areas? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- Being on the same curriculum and Teaching Strategies Gold assessment has been beneficial to both the local school districts and Head Start preschool programs. We also share the same developmental screening tools.
- Blending funding, staffing, children, resources expands Quality Services to more children in each of our communities. We have 10 formal partnerships and have submitted another application in the Community of Broken Bow. We only have 3 Head Start stand-alone centers.
- Enforcing the policies. What does high quality preschool look like? Local schools do not value the home visits.
- I meet monthly (bi-monthly often) with EC folks from the Omaha Public Schools. We work very hard to share resources, etc.
- I think the matrix we use for each of our MOU's tailored to each different LEA/Partnership
- Mid has over 30 LEA agreements with our public schools in our 15,000 square mile service area in Nebraska and Kansas. All are very receptive in signing our MOUs and work in partnership with our center personnel.
- More at risk children are able to receive services because of the collaborations. Shared parent activities has increased the participation of parents in the program. We have implemented a Tailgate Party (for male figures only) at the beginning of the school year; this activity was very successful and increased male participation in the program.

Child Care

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding access to child care services and resources.

- Blending services is difficult if providers are required to meet EHS/HS Performance Standards. We do have formal partnership with DHHS for infant toddler centers in Columbus/Schuyler to go FDFY in our facilities.
- Families that do not qualify for Title XX and need extended hours over the hours provided by Head Start.
- Lack of quality child care in the community
- More difficult for working families to qualify for title XX state child care funds.

What is working well in your efforts to address the child care needs of the children and families in your program? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- We are providing coaching/mentor to many of the providers serving our children/families. This service is provided through Infant Toddler Quality Initiatives.
- We provide both EHS and HS for families needing both options.

Head Start Transition & Alignment with K-12

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding Head Start transition and alignment with K-12 for the children and families in your program.

- EHS program only.
- Few meaningful transition activities are available for our families. The situation is complicated by the number of schools our children may transition to. It is difficult to coordinate with 40 different elementary schools. More work is needed here.
- Mid Head Start does not provide transportation to Head Start centers, however, we have 11 Head Start and 2 Early Head Start family educators in the very rural counties that take services directly to the home environments to work with the parents in the home based model, thus assisting families for preparing children for the public school.
- N/A
- Some of our current formal Pre-K partnership locations are wanting us to use direct instruction (scripted) language and literacy curriculums that are not appropriate for 3 and 4 year olds. Working on how we can adopt some of these practices towards the last half of HS year for successful transitions into kindergarten is a work in progress.
- We prefer to have a day where our children can tour the kindergarten room and experience what a day will look like; many of the teachers that we work with will not allow this to take place.
- We work very well with our LEA

In your efforts to address the education/Head Start transition to school needs of the children and families in your program, what is working well? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- The partnerships that we have with our school districts has been very beneficial in supporting children and their transitions.
- Transition meetings with individual special services staff is beneficial to our families. Our transition program which includes a visit to a Kindergarten classroom and tours of buildings are helpful along with our agency providing parent resources and parent/child school readiness activities/materials for use over the summer.
- We are working very well the LEA to make sure are children are transitioned into the school, Our 4 year old classrooms go the public school at least once a month to visit the Kindergarten classrooms and the kindergarten teachers will visit our program to get familiar with the children.
- We have failed to provide our families with meaningful activities. We are trying to facilitate meaningful meetings between our families and the kindergarten teacher or principal prior to the actual event. We have some ideas we are working on for the upcoming year.

Professional Development

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding professional development activities and resources.

- Additional funding required for training
- CDA system and support needed/Bilingual advisors. Need for a Home Visitor Certificate based on new standards
- The AI/AN Programs have been without a T/TA provider since the beginning of the year and still going without

What is working well in your efforts to address the professional development needs of your staff?

Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- online course work for staff
- Trainers on staff (curriculum, safe with you, CPR); Annual training plans supported by agency and budgets; TEACH is wonderful; UNK/CCC partnerships have been invaluable
- We have our local tribal college that the staff can earn their AA degree in early childhood, we are trying to coordinate with Wayne State College or UNK to get them further. It is a work in progress.

Early Childhood Systems

Please describe any other issues you may have regarding partnerships with early childhood systems efforts in your state.

- I participate in LIPEL and Early Childhood Systems Team conference calls. I receive minutes for these and from the ECICC meetings. Eleanor also reports verbally/handouts at our NeHSA meetings. Head Start agencies need to be invited and present during an Early Childhood Systems meetings.
- Unsure of the answers here what is QRIS.

What is working well in your efforts to partner with early childhood systems initiatives in your state?

Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

- I am an active member in state-wide Early Childhood Systems initiatives. I would like to see more Directors participate.

Appendix B: Survey Participants

Name	City	Phone Number	Contact Name
Community Action Partnership of Western Nebraska	Gering	308-635-3089	Sarah Ochoa
Winnebago Head Start	Winnebago	402-878-2200	Amy La Pointe
Sarpy County Cooperative Head Start	Papillion	402-339-6592	Annette Ferando
Community Action Partnership of Lancaster and Saunders Counties	Lincoln	402-471-4515	Aaron Bowen
SENCA Head Start	Humboldt	402-862-2411	Crystal Dunekacke
Santee Sioux Nation	Niobrara	402-857-2772	Joyce Thomas
Northwest Community Action Partnership	Chadron	308-432-3393	Amy Richardson
Central Nebraska Community Services	Loup City	308-745-0780	Suzan Obermiller
Dodge County Head Start	Fremont	402-721-9022	Stephanie Knust
Educare of Omaha	Omaha	402-898-1783	Gladys Haynes
The Salvation Army	Omaha	402-898-5920	Sharlene Mengel
Boys and Girls Home of NE EHS	Dakota City	402-494-6878	Marjorie Meinen
Community Action Partnership of Mid Nebraska	Kearney	308-865-5675	Lois Butler
Northeast Nebraska Community Action Partnerships, Inc. Formerly known as Goldenrod Hills Community Action	Pender	402-385-6300	Rita Eichelberger
Head Start Child & Family Development Inc.	Hastings	402-462-4187	Deb Ross
Blue Valley Community Action	Fairbury	402-729-2278	Shari Wurtz-Miller