

**Iowa Community Empowerment
Annual Report, State Fiscal Year 2007
July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007**

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please submit the following information utilizing the format provided. Additional pages and information may be included.
2. The annual report is due September 15, 2007.
3. A completed and signed original report should be submitted to the following address **electronically** to the following email:
Iowa Empowerment Board
Attn: Shanell Wagler
Office of Empowerment, Department of Management
Room 12, Ground Floor
State Capitol Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
Shanell.wagler@iowa.gov

Date This Report Approved By Local CEA Board: _____

Name of Community Empowerment Area: Siouxland Human Investment Partnership (SHIP)

Counties/Area Served: Woodbury County

Website: www.siouxlandship.org

Current Board Chairperson: Joyce Brende Kizzier

Current Fiscal Agent: SHIP

Signature: _____

Signature: _____

Address:

Address:

Email: jkizzier@netins.net

Email: jfrance@nwaea.com

Federal ID Number: 42-1495836

Contact Person for the Community Empowerment Area: Matt Ohman
(if different from the Chairperson)
Address: 1501 Morningside Avenue, Sioux City, Iowa 51106
Phone: 712-222-6368 FAX: 712-222-6216
E-mail: mohman@nwaea.com

SECTION I –

a. Current Community Empowerment Board Composition on September 15, 2007

A. Number of Board Members (Board Size) _____

B. Membership Identification. Complete the table below for members on the CEA Board

Column 1 – Name of each board member, starting with Chairperson. Identify any other officers (as determined by your CEA board bylaws.)

Column 2 – Identify the member’s representing the required membership. Note the Faith, Business or Consumer representative member may also qualify as citizen/elected.

Column 3 -- *Name of employing organization of the member, occupation if self employed*

Column 4 -- *Name of services/program provided by CE funds*

Column 5 -- Place a ‘X’ for the board members who qualify as citizen/elected according to the definitions of IAC for Community Empowerment, 349, Chapter I. (“*Citizen*” means a resident of the empowerment area, who is not an elected official or a required representative for education, health, and human services, or a paid staff member of an agency whose services fall under the plan or purview of the community board. A citizen representative may also represent faith, consumer or business.)

If the board does not meet the membership representation criteria, attach the CEA board’s plan how they will meet requirements.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
Name	Representation	Name of Employing Organization	Provider of CE Services/Program	Citizen/Elected
Chair: Joyce Brende Kizzier	Citizen	Immaculate Conception Church	No	X
Vice Chair: Gary Niles	Human Services	Juvenile Court Services	No	X
Secretary Fran Sadden	Human Services	Siouxland District Health	Yes – Resource Center, HOPES & Oral Health Program	
Treasurer Pat Penning	<i>Required human services</i>	Department of Human Services	No	Not Applicable
Mike Stiles	<i>Required health</i>	St. Luke’s Health System	No	Not Applicable
Larry Williams	<i>Required education</i>	Sioux City Community Schools	Yes – Preschool Initiative scholarships	Not Applicable
Kevin Lee	<i>Required faith</i>	Morningside Lutheran Church	Yes – preschool scholarships	
Linda Krei	<i>Required business</i>	Mercy Medical	No	X
Kristie Ver Mulm McManamy	<i>Required consumer</i>	KTIV-TV	No	X
Jim Rixner	Health	Siouxland Mental Health	No	X

07 CEA AR Shell
Revised 2/22/07

Caroline Donaway	Education	Central Campus	No	X
Jim France	Executive Director	Siouxland Human Investment Partnership	No	X
Barbara Aalfs	Business	Comprehensive Strategy	No	X
Audra Cole	Business	Catholic Charities	No	X
Patrick McKinlay	Education	Morningside College	No	X
Roger Hess	Education	Northwest AEA	Yes – professional development programs, Early Access teacher	
George Boykin	Human Services	Board of Supervisors	Yes – preschool scholarships	
Karen Mackey	Human Services	Sioux City Human Rights Commission	No	X
Tim Stiles	Business	United Way of Siouxland	Yes – Imagination Library	
Reverend Patrick Walsh	Faith / Education	Catholic Schools of Siouxland	No	X
Denise Brown	Consumer/Citizen	Lunchtime Solutions	No	X
Charlene Ellis	Consumer/Citizen	Consultant	No	X
Heather Crichton	Consumer/Citizen	Consultant	No	X
Linda Drey	Health	Siouxland District Health	Yes – Resource Center, HOPES & Oral Health Program	

b. Organizational Structure – Please describe:

- Your organizational structure;
- How the board functions, communicates, plans and interacts internally; and
- How the board functions, communicates, plans within the community.

Please see attachment 1 (Amended And Restated Bylaws Of Siouxland Human Investment Partnership)

SECTION II – Community Plan and Collaborative efforts to Achieve Results

Community Plan Updates

Provide a brief list or narrative of changes, *deletions, or revisions*, if any, to the community plan.

(If you are seeking to be redesignated as a Community Empowerment area at this time, please submit a copy of your up to date plan with your annual report.)

We revised our Community Priorities completely, to match the priorities set forth by the state. All of our previous seven community priorities were folded into the new priorities as indicators. We found that our priorities were basically indicators, and we needed to connect them better to the state's priorities.

Community Collaborative Efforts

Definition adopted by Iowa Empowerment Board: Collaboration involves parties who see different aspects of a problem. They engage in a process through which they constructively explore their differences and search for (and implement) solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible. (Gray, 1989). Relationships evolve toward commitment to the common mission, comprehensive communication and planning, pooled resources and shared risks and products. Authority is vested in the collaborative, rather than in individuals or an individual agency.

Describe at least two (2) successful collaborative efforts within the Community Empowerment Area during the last year that promote healthy and successful children 0-5 and their families. The two examples chosen should reflect creative solutions, and a positive engagement and commitment of the community. For each collaborative effort describe the results and explain how each example strives to avoid duplication, enhance efforts, combine planning, and/or other progress.

1. **The Sioux City Preschool Initiative**

SHIP collaborated with the Sioux City Community School District and existing local preschool providers to apply for the Statewide Voluntary Preschool Program with the Department of Education. The program was fully funded and will begin in September of 2007. SHIP will be the fiscal agent for the program, and the department of education funds will be used to pay for certified teachers to teach 10 hours of instruction weekly at each preschool. Nine existing preschools (Angel House, Apple Tree, BB's Preschool, Boys & Girls Home, Crittenton Center, Community Action Agency, Gulliver's Travels, Mary Elizabeth Day Care and Native American Childcare Center) will offer fourteen new classrooms to open access to all 4-year-olds in the school district. Empowerment preschool scholarship dollars will be used to assist families within the poverty guidelines (200% of poverty or below). It was estimated that about 50% of the children served in this program would be on scholarship assistance.

To ensure the quality and consistency of the program, only the High/Scope and Creative Curriculum will be acceptable curriculums, and only the COR assessment will be used to measure growth. All programs participating will be required to be involved in either the QRS or NAEYC accreditation processes. Professional development opportunities will be open to all programs through the Northwest AEA. All certified teachers will attend monthly professional development classes once a month. Each provider will actively recruit 4-year-olds for the program by attending community events leading up to the start of the school year.

In addition, two preschool classrooms were added at one of the elementary schools that will be “integrated” classrooms. Eleven of the children in these classes will be general education students, while the other nine will be special needs students.

The goal of getting at least 255 children in the overall program was exceeded the first week of school. This project has been in the planning stages for nearly two years, so to see it finally come to fruition is a big success for all of the partners.

2. *Even Start Family Literacy Program*

The Even Start Family Literacy Program has been a part of the Sioux City Community Schools since 1993, at Riverside Elementary. The program provides early childhood programming, adult education and parenting education to low income, low literacy families in an integrated format: adult classes and early childhood classes run at the same time, then both groups combine for PACT (Parent and Child Together Time). The program targets families with low levels of English language proficiency in the Sioux City Community School District. The program also has a home visitation component, with each family in the program receiving one monthly home visit.

The program previously operated on funding from the School District, Western Iowa Tech Community College (WITCC), in-kind donations and a federal Even Start Family Literacy grant. For fiscal year 2007, the federal grant portion of the program’s funding was cut by 50%, or \$100,000. Before the funding cut, the program was at capacity, serving 35 families and 42 children, and had a waiting list of 33 families. The program might not have been able to survive, and certainly would not have been able to serve the same amount of families with the funding cut. The program applied for empowerment funding for fiscal year 2007.

The SHIP Grant Review Committee and Board were impressed with the fact that the program would address all five of SHIP’s community priorities. There was also no other program utilizing empowerment funds that was directly addressing the growing need of services to immigrant families and their children. As the program provided early childhood services to children 0-5, and adult education for their parents, it seemed a great fit. Full funding was awarded.

The program exceeded all expectations, goals and objectives for 2007. 48 children and 55 families participated in the program during the school year (some families transitioned in and out of the program). SHIP will continue to fund the program into fiscal year 2008.

SECTION III - Achieving Results

Community Plan Priorities

1. Children Ready to Succeed In School
2. Healthy Children
3. Safe & Supportive Communities
4. Secure & Nurturing Child Care Environments
5. Secure & Nurturing Families

Community Plan Indicators

Identify the indicators as determined by the CEA Board and how the indicators are linked to the State Results.

Definition: Indicators are measures that quantify the achievement of a result and your priorities.

Definition: Goals are broad measurable statements of intent to set a future direction.

1. Children Ready to Succeed In School

- Increase the number of children with preschool / group experience prior to kindergarten.
- Increase the quality of preschool and child care programs in Woodbury County.
- Increase the level of performance of children in the areas of learning, communication, movement, self-help, social skills and emotional health.
- Increase the number of kindergarten transition programs.
- Increase the number of children participating in kindergarten transition programs.
- Increase access to quality preschool and child care for low-income families.

2. Healthy Children

- Increase the percent of children with established medical homes.
- Increase the percent of children with established dental homes.
- Increase the percent of children with medical insurance.
- Address the mental health issues for children 0-5.
- Increase the percent of kindergarten surveys returned.

3. Safe & Supportive Communities

- Increase the number of individuals participating in family support services.

- Establish or strengthen community support, participation, interest and cooperation in developing priorities for all young children and their families.
- Increase the general public's awareness of family support services, preschool programs, and other services that benefit families of children 0-5.

4. Secure & Nurturing Child Care Environments

- Increase the number of accredited child care centers.
- Increase the number of infants served in child care centers or registered homes.
- Increase the number of registered child care homes.
- Increase access to affordable, quality child care / early education environments.

5. Secure & Nurturing Families

- Increase the number of families with sufficient resources to meet and provide for child well-being.
- Reduce the risk of child abuse and neglect.
- Increase parenting skills and parent knowledge of child development.
- Decrease domestic violence.
- Increase and establish support for family literacy.
- Increase family safety and mobility by establishing a stronger transportation system.

Codes for Identifying state results for Indicators:

- A. Healthy Children**
- B. Secure & Nurturing Families**
- C. Secure & Nurturing Child Care Environments**
- D. Children Ready to Succeed in School**
- E. Safe & Supportive Communities**

FOR EACH INDICATOR, CALCULATE ON THE TOTAL NUMBER OF 0-5 POPULATION IN THE CEA.

If actual data is not available, please insert NA and provide an explanation in the Progress Update column.

Community Empowerment Area Indicators	Identify the State Results Linked to the Indicator by A, B, C, D, E	Identify Source of data for each Indicator	Baseline Data (date & numerical value)	Sub-Sequent Year's Data (Trend Line) Identify Year			Goal (numerical value & projected timeline)	Progress Update (Brief Analysis of data)
				2005 -	2006 -	2007 -		
Number of programs with written goals/objectives which are appropriate for children 3-5	D, E	Program outcomes	2004 – 14	2005 - 16	2006 - 18	2007 - 25	Increase by 5% by 2008	2007 saw an increase in number of programs serving children 3-5, including two kindergarten transition

								programs, more preschools utilizing scholarship and health & safety funds, and Even Start.
Number of providers accessing professional development	D, C	Program outcomes, WITCC final report	2004 – 112	2005 - 116	2006 - 136	2007 - 198	Increase by 5% by 2008	SHIP's scholarships program for Early Childhood workers at WITCC continues to grow in popularity. We also continued funding Every Child Reads, QPPS, Centering On Centers and added a FDCERS training this year for in-home providers. We also funded a Creative Curriculum implementation training.
Number of programs who use ongoing standardized assessments of young children	D, C	Program outcomes	2004 – 9	2005 - 10	2006 - 12	2007 - 14	Increase by 5% by 2008	There is currently a wide variety of assessment tools being used by centers and preschools. As more and more providers increase quality of their programs, more are using the approved standardized assessment tools.
Number of programs seeking NAEYC or QRS accreditation	D,C	Program outcomes	2004 – 8	2005 - 14	2006 - 15	2007 - 19	Increase by 5% by 2008	The QRS has taken off in Woodbury County. All of our centers or preschools have to be involved in a quality initiative to receive funding.
Percentage of children entering kindergarten with prior group	D	Kindergarten survey	2003 – 83%	2005 – 88%	2006 – 90.4%	2007 – 91.8%	Increase by 5% by 2008	We continue to see small growth in number of children with preschool

experience								experience. We hope to up the percentage next year after the first year of our preschool initiative program.
Percentage of children with established dental home	A	Kindergarten survey	2003 – 88%	2005 – 92%	2006 – 92%	2007 – 94.2%	Increase by 5% by 2008	This indicator’s continued increase can be attributed to our aggressive Oral Health Program.
Percentage of children with established medical homes	A,B	Kindergarten survey	2003 – 93%	2005 – 96%	2006 – 98%	2007 – 98.6%	Increase by 5% by 2008	This indicator’s continued increase can be attributed to our resource centers and home visitation programs, each of which help families find medical homes.
Number of families participating in family support services	E	Program outcomes	2001 – 49	2005 – 60	2006 – 67	2007 – 2,583	Increase by 5% by 2008	I don’t know where previous numbers came from, but this year I used total # of families served by each Home Visitation program, plus Even Start, La Cassa Latina, Early Access, and the Resource Centers. The three new programs this year can account for some of the growth, but I’m pretty sure the numbers are incorrect from previous years.
Number of infant care slots	C	Child Care Resource & Referral	2007 - 459				Increase by 5% by 2011	Previous years numbers were inaccurate, and we’ve seriously revamped a Child Care Support Services program specifically to increase infant slots, so we’re using this year as

								baseline.
Percentage of registered childcare homes	C	Child Care Resource & Referral	1999 – 64%	2005 – 47%	2006 – 38%	2007 – 43%	Increase by 21% by 2008	This is a tough indicator since so many new, unregistered child care providers pop up every year and skewer the percentages. We are hopeful because our numbers did go up for the first time in several years.
Number of scholarships through empowerment	C	Program outcomes	2005 – 36	2006 - 90	2007 - 223	2008 – N/A	Increase by 50% by 2008	2007 was the third year for scholarships. We assist low income families not supported by DHS at child care centers, preschools and in-home child care. These programs keep growing every year.
Educational level of child care providers	C	Program outcomes	2007 – Associates Degree: 12 Bachelors Degree: 9 Post Graduate Degree: 1				Increase educational level of providers by 3% by 2011.	2007 is the first year this data has been tracked each month via the providers’ monthly reports. Previous years, the results were estimates based off of an informal provider survey, so the results were terribly inaccurate. We decided to use 2007 as the baseline year to accurately track this data, and set a realistic 5-year goal.
Number of children confirmed as child abuse and neglect victims	B	Prevent Child Abuse Iowa, DHS	2004 – 580	2005 – 602	2006 – 591	2007 - 527	Reduce by 2% by 2008	This indicator is down by 10% from 2006.
Number of domestic assaults	B	Sioux City Police Department	2003 – 261	2004 - 267	2005 – 269	2006 - 237	Reduce by 2% by 2008	This indicator continues to stay pretty moderate. Counted are serious and aggravated domestic

								assaults.
Percentage of families participating in resource center educational opportunities that report the activity met their need	B	Program outcomes	2004 – 99%	2005 – 100%	2006 – 100%	2007 – 99.6%	Maintain at least a 90% success rate	Clients utilizing resource centers feel that the programs meet their needs

SECTIONS IV and V - Programs/Services to Support the Priorities - including Program/Services Performance Measures

Report program performance measures using the following language:

- Input** - what has been invested in financial and non-financial resources? (dollars invested, number of staff, etc)
- Output** - what was produced or changed as an effect of the effort put forth? (number served or trained, number of events, number meeting program outcome, etc)
- Quality** - How qualified and efficiently was the activity or service delivered? (percent of qualified staff, percent of customers satisfied, cost or rate per unit, ratio of staff to children, etc)
- Outcome** - What was the change in conditions for the people served? (percent meeting the outcome, percent gaining knowledge, percent making change in condition, etc)

All columns should have quantitative or numerical data.

SECTION IV – Performance Measures: Community Empowerment Early Childhood Funds
All columns should have quantitative or numerical data.

Early Childhood Funds

These categories align with the funding parameters identified in Tool G of the Community Empowerment Tool Kit, http://www.empowerment.state.ia.us/common/pdf/kit_tools/toolG.pdf. The categories are as follows:

- Capacity Building/Access to Child Care or Preschools
- Quality Improvement Support/Incentives
- Extended hours/2nd or 3rd shift care/infant care/mildly ill care
- Home or Center Child Care Consultants
- Child Care Nurse Consultants
- Provider Training/Professional Development/Materials
- Other Services

For each service listed, in the first column, please include a category from bulleted list above as well as a brief description of the program being supported. Items should align with the corresponding lines on the financial statement.)

Early Childhood Services Provided	Link to Which Comm. Plan Priority or Priorities (as noted in Section III)	How Much Was Invested? (Input Measures) <i>Note: Fiscal Investments must coincide with fiscal part of this report</i>	How Much Was Done or Produced? (Output Measures)	How Well Did We Do It? (Quality/ Efficiency Measures)	What Was the Change In Conditions for Those We Served? (Outcome Measures)
<p>West High School Infant Care Center</p> <p>Infant Care</p> <p>An infant care center at a local high school provides parents with the opportunity to get their high school diploma and learn parenting skills.</p>	<p>4, 5</p>	<p>\$26,224.37 empowerment funds, # staff members: 2.5 staff</p>	<p># of students enrolled in program: 12 total students enrolled (10 moms and 2 dads)</p>	<p>% of parenting students satisfied with infant care: 100% Cost per infant: \$2,913.81 (9 infants)</p>	<p>% of filled slots at infant care center: 75% (12 slots open)</p>
<p>West High School Infant Care Center Family Transportation</p> <p>Capacity Building/ Access to Daycare</p> <p>Transportation provided to two teenage mothers to attend school and send their infants to the daycare. These women could not have participated in the program without this.</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>\$4,027.42 empowerment funds</p>	<p># of students enrolled in program: 2 mothers</p>	<p>% of parenting students satisfied with transportation: 100% Cost per student: \$2,013.71 (2 students for 3 months)</p>	<p>% of students who attended class due to having access to transportation: 100% (both students finished the school year)</p>

<p>Boys and Girls Home ILC Daycare</p> <p>Infant Care</p> <p>Parents can use the daycare while they take classes to pursue their GED.</p>	<p>4, 5</p>	<p>\$43,260.21 empowerment funds, \$3,562 DHS funds, \$325 Promise Jobs funds # eligible students: 16 # students applying: 12 # staff members: 2 (1 FTE + 1 PTE)</p>	<p># of children enrolled in program: 12</p> <p># of parents graduated: 5</p>	<p>% of those applied who participate in program (enrolled divided by applying): 100%</p> <p>Cost per child: \$3,928.93 (empowerment, DHS & Promise jobs funds divided by number of children)</p> <p>Cost per child with just empowerment funds: \$3,605</p>	<p>% of parents increasing their parenting skills: 100%</p> <p>Average daily attendance for parents at school: 44%</p>
<p>Mid-Sioux Opportunity: Child Care Nurse Consultant</p> <p>This contract covered the part-time CCNC, until the Quality Rewards dollars came along and another contract bumped her position up to full-time.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>\$15,000 empowerment funds, # FTE local child care consultant: 1/2</p>	<p># CCNC contacts with child care: 1301</p> <p># hours spent on direct Child Care Nurse Consultant activities: 390</p> <p># and % increase formal Business Agreements between CCNC and child care providers. : 26 new Agreements (77 active) and 50% increase</p> <p># of Health & Safety Surveys from child care providers: 24</p> <p># of Injury prevention assessments: 41</p> <p>#of Child Record Reviews: 4</p> <p># of Health &</p>	<p>% increase in contacts: -28%</p> <p>% increase in direct contact hours: -21% (decrease in percentage of contacts and direct contact hours due to the position being vacant for 4 months, and increased time needed in training 2 new CCNCs)</p>	<p>% of change measured via improved score on Health & Safety Assessment: Not enough Health & Safety data completed to analyze this data for SFY07</p> <p>Increase the rate of child care businesses receiving the injury prevention checklist: Increase 46% of new injury prevention assessments completed in SFY07 compared to SFY06</p>

			Safety assessments: 1		
<p>Mid-Sioux Opportunity: In-Home Child Care Support</p> <p>Home Child Care Consultant</p> <p>Incentive program for in-home providers to increase quality (QRS) and open up infant care slots</p>	4	<p>\$50,000 empowerment funds, \$25,000 other funds (.5 FTE Home Consultant)</p> <p># in-home infant care capacity beginning of FY: 664 # providers enrolled in Quality Rewards: 108 # registered child care homes: 190 # provider contacts made by Home Consultant: 913 # FTE Home Consultant position: 1.0</p>	<p># current in-home infant care capacity: 664</p> <p># providers redeeming Quality Rewards incentives: 103</p> <p># unduplicated providers given consultation : 222 # new registered providers: 50 # providers achieving 85% compliance by fourth Home Consultant visit: 33</p>	<p>% increase in infant care capacity: 0% % providers meeting Quality Rewards requirements: 95% # Home Consultant to unduplicated providers given consultation: 1:222</p>	<p>% providers increasing health and safety standards through Quality Rewards: 98%</p> <p>% of child development home providers achieving 85% compliance by the fourth Home Consultant visit: 100%</p>
<p>Child Care Scholarships</p> <p>Capacity Building</p> <p>Center-based child care scholarships for low-income parents between 145 – 185% of the federal poverty level.</p> <p>Total number of</p>	1, 4, 5	<p>Amount expended: \$9,665</p> <p>Educational Level of Head Teacher(s) (Total number of each):</p> <p>GED: High School Diploma: 2 Child Development Associate: 0 AA Degree in EC or child development: 1 AA Degree in related field: 0 BA/BS in EC or child development: 0 BA/BS in related field: 0</p>	<p>Total Number of children (Unduplicated): 15</p> <p>Number of children by age (Unduplicated): 0 Year Olds: 1 1 Year Olds: 4 2 Year Olds: 6 3 Year Olds: 4</p> <p>Number of children by Gender</p>	<p>For Children Supported with these funds:</p> <p>Percent of children with health insurance: 100%</p>	<p>For Children Supported with these funds:</p> <p>Percent of children demonstrating age appropriate skills: 100%</p> <p>(Identify the assessment tool(s) used to determine the children’s development): teacher-developed</p>

<p>centers receiving Child Care Support: 3</p> <p># of funded programs meeting the following standards:</p> <p>NAEYC: 0</p> <p>Shared Visions: 0</p> <p>Head Start: 0</p> <p>ECER average score of 5 (with no subscale score under 2): 0</p> <p>Participating in QPPS process: 2</p> <p>QRS rating of 3, 4 or 5: 0</p> <p>In process for completing any of the above quality standards: 3</p> <p>Meeting comparable standard: 0</p>		<p>Post Graduate Degree: 0</p> <p>Number of funded programs utilizing a Child Care Nursing Consultant for technical assistance: 3</p> <p>Curriculum(s) used by funded programs: Theme-based curriculum BEKA (Christian-based) Creative Curriculum-based</p>	<p>(Unduplicated): Female: 8 Male: 7</p> <p>Number of children by Race (Unduplicated) White: 12 Black/African American: 0 Asian: 0 Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0 More than one race reported: 3 Other/Unknown: 0</p> <p>Number of children by ethnicity (Unduplicated): Hispanic/Latino: 0 Not Hispanic/Latino: 15</p> <p>Number of children with health insurance: 15</p> <p>Number of children with age appropriate skills: 15</p>		
<p>Northwest AEA Creative Curriculum Training</p> <p>Provider training / Professional Development</p> <p>Curriculum</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Amount Expended: \$7,985.85</p> <p>(Report any other applicable input measures)</p>	<p><u>Total number of participants by:</u></p> <p>Number of Administrators/Directors: 8</p> <p>Number of Teachers/Early Childhood</p>	<p><u>Percent of all participants completing coursework by:</u></p> <p>Percent of Administrators/Directors: 100%</p> <p>Percent of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 100%</p>	<p>Percent of participants who report incorporating learning into policy or practice: 90% (2 providers switched to High/Scope later when that curriculum was adopted by the new preschool initiative)</p>

<p>training offered to centers adopting and implementing Creative Curriculum</p>			<p>Providers: 12</p> <p>Number of Assistant Teachers: 1</p> <p><u>Report as applicable:</u> Total number of credits earned: N/A Average number of credits earned by participants: N/A Number of participants working toward CDA: N/A Number of participants working toward associate degree: N/A Number of participants working toward bachelor degree: N/A</p>	<p>Percent of Assistant Teachers: 100%</p> <p>Average cost per participant: \$380.28</p> <p><u>Report as applicable:</u></p> <p>Average cost per credit hour: N/A Percent of participants completing associate degree: N/A Percent of participants completing bachelor degree: N/A Percent of participants completing DIP/Certification: N/A</p>	<p>(Report any other applicable participant outcomes)</p>
<p>Iowa State Extension FDCERS Training</p> <p>Provider training / Professional Development</p> <p>Family Developmental Child Care Environmental Rating Scale I training for in-home family child care providers</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Amount Expended: \$1,533.54</p> <p>(Report any other applicable input measures)</p>	<p><u>Total number of participants by:</u></p> <p>Number of Administrators/Directors: 7 (all attending were in-home family child care providers)</p> <p>Number of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: N/A</p> <p>Number of Assistant Teachers: N/A</p>	<p><u>Percent of all participants completing coursework by:</u></p> <p>Percent of Administrators/Directors: 100%</p> <p>Percent of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: N/A</p> <p>Percent of Assistant Teachers: N/A</p> <p>Average cost per participant: \$267.14</p> <p><u>Report as applicable:</u></p>	<p>Percent of participants who report incorporating learning into policy or practice: 100%</p> <p>(Report any other applicable participant outcomes)</p>

			<p><u>Report as applicable:</u> Total number of credits earned: N/A Average number of credits earned by participants: N/A Number of participants working toward CDA: N/A Number of participants working toward associate degree: N/A Number of participants working toward bachelor degree: N/A</p>	<p>Average cost per credit hour: N/A Percent of participants completing associate degree: N/A Percent of participants completing bachelor degree: N/A Percent of participants completing DIP/Certification: N/A</p>	
<p>Western Iowa Tech Community College (WITCC)</p> <p>Provider training / Professional Development</p> <p>To improve the quality of the child care workers and preschool teachers in Woodbury, SHIP provides scholarships that pay for full tuition and books for any person working in Early Childhood in</p>	4	<p>Amount Expended: \$32,000 (Report any other applicable input measures)</p>	<p><u>Total number of participants by:</u></p> <p>Number of Administrators/Directors: 3</p> <p>Number of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 8</p> <p>Number of Assistant Teachers: 7</p> <p><u>Report as applicable:</u> Total number of credits earned: 150 Average number of credits earned by participants: 8.3</p>	<p><u>Percent of all participants completing coursework by:</u></p> <p>Percent of Administrators/Directors: 17%</p> <p>Percent of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 44%</p> <p>Percent of Assistant Teachers: 39%</p> <p>Average cost per participant: \$1,778</p> <p><u>Report as applicable:</u></p> <p>Average cost per credit hour: \$112 on campus, \$130 online Percent of participants</p>	<p>Percent of participants who report incorporating learning into policy or practice: 95%</p> <p>(Report any other applicable participant outcomes)</p>

<p>Woodbury County. Most classes are taken online.</p>			<p>Number of participants working toward CDA: 4 Number of participants working toward associate degree: 14 Number of participants working toward bachelor degree: 0</p>	<p>completing associate degree: 0; 14 seeking AA/AAS degree Percent of participants completing bachelor degree: 0 Percent of participants completing DIP/Certification: 39%</p>	
<p>All-Day Preschool Classroom Startup Materials</p> <p>Capacity Building</p> <p>Project to fund start-up costs for materials to open an Early Childhood preschool classroom serving 18 four-year-olds.</p>	<p>1, 4</p>	<p>\$15,000 empowerment funds, # of non-Head Start all-day preschool classrooms FY07: 1 (this one)</p>	<p># students enrolled in class: 18</p> <p># of items purchased : 717</p> <p># of categories scoring a "5" or higher on the ECERS-R evaluation for age appropriateness of materials purchased: 12 (out of 14)</p>	<p>% of parent surveys returned: 100%</p> <p>% of cateogires scoring a "5" or higher on the ECERS-R evaluation for age appropriateness of materials purchased: 86%</p>	<p>% children remaining in class all year: 100%</p> <p>% of parents that felt the program provided a quality classroom that was equipped with age-appropriate materials: 100%</p> <p>% of children demonstrating age-appropriate skills: 95%</p>
<p>Health and Safety Projects</p> <p>Quality Improvement / Support</p> <p>Projects helped make health and safety changes to 16 centers</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>\$112,985.78 empowerment funds</p> <p>Playground equipment or surfacing projects: 4</p> <p>New flooring projects: 5</p> <p>New kitchen appliances (refrigerators, stoves, exhaust systems): 3</p>	<p># of projects completed: 16</p> <p># of center-based projects completed: 14</p> <p># of in-home provider projects completed: 2</p>	<p>Average cost per project: \$7,066</p>	<p>% of providers who felt the children were safer after the completion of the health and safety project; 100%</p> <p>% of providers who were able to get a higher QRS rating after project completion; 56% (Many centers had not received their new rating prior to the end of the fiscal year)</p>

<p>and providers to obtain higher QRS ratings (as suggested by Child Care Nurse Consultant).</p>		<p>Security systems/alarm systems: 2</p> <p>Incentives: 1</p> <p>Safety objects (changing tables, fire-retardant cots or blinds, evacuation cribs, etc.): 7</p>			
<p>Accreditation Projects</p> <p>Quality Improvement / Support</p> <p>Projects helped centers and programs pay for staff time, fees, applications and team visits to secure accreditations.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>\$10,364.60 empowerment funds</p> <p>HOPES/ HFA Credentialing: 1</p> <p>Iowa QRS (staff time to secure a higher rating): 2</p> <p>NAEYC accreditation: 2</p> <p>NAFCC in-home accreditation process: 1</p> <p>Curriculum purchases and implementation: 1</p>	<p># of projects completed: 6</p> <p># of center-based projects completed: 5</p> <p># of in-home provider projects completed: 1</p> <p>project that paid for 4 in-home providers</p>	<p>Average cost per project: \$1,727</p>	<p>% of providers that were able to secure accreditation: 83% (the provider that purchased curriculum and materials did not get a higher QRS rating or secure any other sort of accreditation, though it did help to increase the quality of the program.</p> <p>% of providers that feel their programs are of a higher quality because of the accreditation projects: 100%</p>

<p>La Casa Latina: Madres y Ninos Program</p> <p>Other Services</p> <p>A three-prong project: structured child care and preschool for infants, toddlers and preschoolers; working with mothers and families on English skills, life skills and literacy skills to be better parents; assisting families crises or life problems, helping them pursue self-sufficiency (after class hours).</p>	<p>1,3,5</p>	<p>\$31,039.75 empowerment funds</p> <p>\$7,400 other funding</p>	<p>Number of children 0-5 participating in the family support program): 10</p> <p>Number of adults participating in the family support classes: 35</p> <p>Number of families participating in the program: 21</p>	<p>Ratio of staff to students: 1:35 adults 1:5 preschool 1:5 infant & toddler</p> <p>% of children in program with a medical home: 15%</p> <p>% of children in program with a dental home: 9%</p>	<p>% of children in preschool program demonstrating age appropriate skills: 83%</p> <p>% of adults showing growth in knowledge of basic family and living skills: 93%</p>
<p>Riverside Elementary: First Book Club</p> <p>Other Services</p> <p>Funds were used to</p>	<p>1,3,5</p>	<p>\$122.02 empowerment funds</p>	<p>Number of families participating in the program: 21</p> <p>Number of children participating: : 21</p>	<p>% of families attending more than 1 session: 86%</p>	<p>% of children attending sessions that improved literacy skills: 95%</p> <p>% of families attending sessions that reported more time spent with children reading at home: 90%</p> <p>% of families reporting</p>

<p>supplement an IPTV program at Riverside School's pre-K program (to purchase snacks for families).</p>			<p>Number of parents participating: 32</p>		<p>satisfaction with the sessions: 95%</p>
<p>Iowa State Extension: CD-DIAL Hispanic Survey</p> <p>Other Services</p> <p>Addendum to Woodbury County Family Survey 2006, which focused primarily on Hispanic families</p>	<p>1,2,3,4,5</p>	<p>\$850 empowerment funds</p>	<p>Number of questionnaires filled out and returned: 65</p>	<p>% of data from the returned questionnaires were used in the results: 100%</p>	<p>% of SHIP staff that read the report and reported they gained knowledge of Early Childhood needs in Woodbury County: 100%</p> <p>% of Early Childhood Large Group that read the report and reported they gained knowledge of Early Childhood needs in Woodbury County: 100%</p>
<p>Siouxland Professional Family Childcare Association</p> <p>Building Bridges</p>	<p>1,3,4,5</p>	<p>\$500 empowerment funds</p> <p>\$1,500 other funds (Siouxland Professional Family Childcare Association)</p>	<p>Total number attending: 34</p> <p>Parents: 2</p> <p>In-Home Providers: 31</p>	<p>% of attendees receiving evaluations for conference: 100%</p> <p>% of evaluations returned: 90%</p>	<p>% of surveyed that reported they gained knowledge from conference: 100%</p> <p>% of providers surveyed that incorporated conference suggestions into their daily practices: 78%</p>

<p>Conference</p> <p>An event for in-home and center-based providers and parents, speaker lectured on suggestions and tips to strengthen parent/provider relationships.</p>			<p>Center providers: 1</p>		
<p>Northwest AEA: Early Access Childhood Teacher</p> <p>Other Services</p> <p>Funds were used to pay .4 of the salary of a new early access teacher</p>	<p>1,3,4,5</p>	<p>\$26,166 empowerment funds</p> <p>\$40,680 other funds</p>	<p>Total number of children served: 25</p> <p>Total number of families served: 25</p>	<p>% of infants & toddlers that received Early Intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner: 100%</p> <p>% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within the 45-day timeline: 100%</p> <p>% of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs: 2.1%</p> <p>% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children: 97.3%</p>	<p>% of families participating who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs: 95.5%</p> <p>% of families participating who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn: 97%</p>

SECTION V – Performance Measures: Community Empowerment School Ready Funds
All columns should have quantitative or numerical data.

School Ready Funds

These categories align with the funding parameters identified in Tool G of the Community Empowerment Tool Kit, http://www.empowerment.state.ia.us/common/pdf/kit_tools/toolG.pdf. The categories are as follows:

- **Preschool Support for Low Incomes Families**

*The FY 07 School Ready funds to assist low-income families with preschool services must be used for families at or below **200%** of the federal poverty level. However, if sufficient funds are available to meet the needs of families meeting this requirement, the CEA Board may use a sliding scale or other co-payment provision for families above this federal poverty level.*

- **Family Support and Parent Education – Prenatal through age 3**

*The FY 07 School Ready funds that support Family Support and Parent Education Programs for families with children ages prenatal through age 3 **must** have a home visitation component.*

- **Family Support and Parent Education – Prenatal through age 5**

In FY 07 the legislature designated that after allocation of all funds designated for other purposes, the CE board shall commit 60% of the remaining funds to provide family support services and parent education for children ages prenatal through 5. A home visitation component is not necessary.

- **Professional Development Activities w/ AEA, Community Colleges**

The SR funds for the purpose of Professional Development that were designated last year (FY 06) will not be a requirement for the use of FY 07 SR funding. However, any carry forward funds from FY 06 that were designated for this purpose must be expended on Professional Development activities.

- **Quality Improvement Funds**

In FY 07 these funds were appropriated to improve quality of the early care, health and education programs. Areas will report performance measures data regarding funded projects.

- **Other Programs/Services**

Programs/services that are providing other services. Examples of other services may include professional development for child care and preschool providers, nutrition, health and dental services, consultation services for early care, health and education providers, and quality improvements for early childhood programs.

The total amount expended in each section (Family Support prenatal-3, Family Support prenatal-5, Preschool Tuition, Professional Development, Quality Improvement, and Other) should align with the corresponding lines on the financial statement.

For each service listed, in the first column, please include a category from bulleted list above as well as a brief description of the program being supported. Items should coincide with budget line items.)

Family Support Performance Measures (use one row for each funded program) – Refer to Tool FF
PRENATAL THROUGH AGE 3 funding – must include a home visitation component.

Name of Family Support Program	Link to Which Comm. Plan Priority or Priorities (as noted in Section III)	How Much Was Invested? (Input Measures) Note: Fiscal Investments must coincide with fiscal report in Family Support prenatal through three	How Much Was Done or Produced? (Output Measures)	How Well Did We Do It? (Quality/ Efficiency Measures)	What Was the Change In Conditions for Those We Served? (Outcome Measures)
HOPES (0-3)	2, 3, 5	\$190,918 empowerment funds	Number of children participating in the family support program utilizing a home visiting service delivery model (Unduplicated): 152 Number of families participating in the family support program utilizing a home visitation service delivery model (Unduplicated): 152 Number of face to face visits completed: 12,331	Percent of children, 0 –3 years old, while enrolled in the program, who are referred for Early ACCESS services: 11.42%	(Insert any child or family outcome measures reported by the program) % of families within 1 year that will address safety issues and improve/resolve the identified safety risks listed on the Home Assessment form conducted at entry, six months and 1 year: 92% % of all children in program that have medical homes: 99% % of children that receive age-appropriate immunizations and well-child medical exams within 6 months of being in the program: 99% % of families that make progress toward the next level on the Family Levels form: 95% Percent of satisfied clients at time of exit: 100%

--	--	--	--	--	--

Family Support Performance Measures Prenatal through 5 (use one row for each funded program) – Refer to Tool FF

Name of Family Support Program (Coincide w/ Budget Line Items)	Link to Which Comm. Plan Priority or Priorities (as noted in Section III)	How Much Was Invested? (Input Measures) Note: Fiscal Investments must coincide with fiscal report in prenatal through five	How Much Was Done or Produced? (Output Measures)	How Well Did We Do It? (Quality/ Efficiency Measures)	What Was the Change In Conditions for Those We Served? (Outcome Measures)
HOPEs (4-5)	<p>Healthy Children,</p> <p>Secure & Nurturing Families</p>	\$78,864	<p>Number of children participating in the family support program utilizing a home visiting service delivery model (Unduplicated): 16</p> <p>Number of families participating in the family support program utilizing a home visitation service delivery model (Unduplicated): 16</p> <p>Number of face to face visits completed: 261</p>	<p>Percent of children, 0 –3 years old, while enrolled in the program, who are referred for Early ACCESS services: 0% (the children served in this portion of the HOPEs contract are 4 & 5)</p>	<p>(Insert any child or family outcome measures reported by the program)</p> <p>% of families within 1 year that will address safety issues and improve/resolve the identified safety risks listed on the Home Assessment form conducted at entry, six months and 1 year: 95%</p> <p>% of all children in program that have medical homes: 99%</p> <p>% of children that receive age-appropriate immunizations and well-child medical exams within 6 months of being in the program: 99%</p> <p>% of families that make progress toward the next level on the Family Levels form: 99%</p> <p>Percent of satisfied clients at time of exit: 100%</p>

<p>Siouxland District Health Resource Center</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>\$151,049 empowerment funds, 2.85 FTE # FTE staff</p>	<p># of screenings: 12 # of individual trainings scheduled: 588 # of group trainings scheduled: 76 # of Resource Center contacts 2,889</p>	<p>% of satisfaction surveys showed a positive response: 100%</p>	<p>% of parents accessing services at the resource center identified an individual or family need as it related to their child's development: 66% % of families completed an evidence based child development program: 59ⁱ%</p>
<p>Westside Resource Center</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>\$201,406 empowerment funds 5.0 FTE (empowerment only)</p>	<p># of training sessions held: 403 # of families served : 1,258 # of individuals served: 10,634 # of home visits: 1,068</p>	<p>% of clients reporting they were satisfied with the services they received: 99%</p>	<p>% of families participating in group educational opportunities: 82% % of families with a medical home: 79% % of parents who report they gained child development knowledge (Survey) 98% % of parents who show improved parenting skills (pre-post tests) 96%</p>
<p>Community Action Agency: Infants & Toddlers Home Visitation Program</p>	<p>2,3,5</p>	<p>\$46,246.86 empowerment funds</p>	<p>Number of children participating in the family support program utilizing a home visiting service delivery model (Unduplicated): 14 Number of families participating in</p>	<p>Annual Retention Rate: 100% % of children in program with a medical home: 100% % of children in program with a dental home: 97%</p>	<p>% of children who are working toward an individualized goal: 100% % of families participating in the family goal setting process: 85% % of children have completed developmental assessments, resulting in 5 referrals for further assessment: 100% % of children have completed social emotional assessments, resulting in 1 referral for further</p>

			<p>the family support program utilizing a home visitation service delivery model (Unduplicated): 11</p> <p>Number of face to face visits completed: 624</p>		<p>assessment: 92%</p>
<p>Even Start Family Literacy Program</p>	<p>1, 2,3,4,5</p>	<p>\$100,000 empowerment funds</p> <p>\$90,000 School District funds</p> <p>\$107,444 in-kind funds (School District, IPTV Ready To Learn, Northwest AEA, Siouxland District Health Department, Lutheran Services of Iowa, Federal Lunch Program, Parent Volunteer hours, Western Iowa Tech, Sioux City Journal, private donations)</p>	<p>Number of children participating in the family support program utilizing a home visiting service delivery model (Unduplicated): 48</p> <p>Number of families participating in the family support program utilizing a home visitation service delivery model (Unduplicated): 55</p> <p>Number of face to face visits completed: 452</p>	<p>Ratio of staff to students: 1:8 preschool 1:6 toddler room 1:20 adult classroom</p> <p>% of children in program with a medical home: 96%</p> <p>% of children in program with a dental home: 96%</p>	<p>% of children in preschool program demonstrating age appropriate skills: 88%</p> <p>% of children in infant/toddler COR program demonstrating age appropriate skills: 91%</p> <p>% of families that have reached a level 4 or have moved up one level on the Parent Education Profile (PEP): 66%</p> <p>% of parents that showed growth between their pre and post reading CASAS test: 88%</p> <p>% of parents that showed growth between their pre and post listening CASAS test: 93%</p>

Preschool Programming (Tuition) Support for Low-Income Families - Performance Measures - Refer to Tool CC (B)

Programs Funded	Link to Which Comm. Plan Priority or Priorities (as noted in Section III)	How Much Was Invested? (Input Measures) Note: Fiscal Investments must coincide with fiscal report	How Much Was Done or Produced? (Output Measures)	How Well Did We Do It? (Quality/Efficiency Measures)	What Was the Change In Conditions for Those We Served? (Outcome Measures)
<p>Total number of preschool programs/centers receiving Preschool Support: 17</p> <p>Number of funded Programs meeting the following standards:</p> <p>NAEYC Accreditation: 2</p> <p>Shared Visions: 1</p> <p>Head Start: 1</p> <p>ECER average score of 5 (with no subscale score under 2): 1</p> <p>Participating in QPPS process: 11</p> <p>QRS rating of 3, 4 or 5: 2</p> <p>In process for completing any of the above quality standards: 7</p> <p>Meeting comparable standard (also identify standard):</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Amount expended: \$321,048.96</p> <p>Educational Level of Head Teacher(s) (Total number of each):</p> <p>GED: 0 High School Diploma: 1 Child Development Associate: 2 AA Degree in EC or child development: 8 AA Degree in related field: 1 BA/BS in EC or child development: 4 BA/BS in related field: 5 Post Graduate Degree: 1</p> <p>Number of funded programs utilizing a Child Care Nursing Consultant for technical assistance: 9</p> <p>Curriculum(s) used by funded programs:</p> <p>Active Learning: 1 Creative Curriculum: 9 Creative Curriculum-based (Teacher developed): 1 Here We Go Watch Me Grow: 1 High/Scope: 4 OWLS (Opening the World of Learning): 1 Peabody Language Development: 1 Second Step: 1 Teacher Developed: 1</p>	<p>For Children Supported with these funds:</p> <p>Total Number of children : 183 Number of children by age (Unduplicated): 3 Year Olds: 28 4 Year Olds: 106 5 Year Olds: 48 Number of children by Gender (Unduplicated): Female: 89 Male: 94 Number of children by Race (Unduplicated) White: 134 Native American: 16 Black/African American: 16 Asian: 1 Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0 More than one race reported: 5 Other/Unknown: 11 Number of children by ethnicity (Unduplicated): Hispanic/Latino: 43 Not Hispanic/Latino: 140 Number of children with health insurance: 166; 17 w/out Number of children with age appropriate skills: 169; 14 w/out</p>	<p>For Children Supported with these funds:</p> <p>Percent of Children with health insurance: 91%</p>	<p>For Children Supported with these funds:</p> <p>Percent of children demonstrating age appropriate skills: 92%</p> <p>(Identify the assessment tool(s) used to determine the children's development)</p> <p>Ages and Stages Brigance Screen: 2 CAPERS (AEA assessment tool): 2 Creative Assessments (Creative Curriculum): 3 Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum: 2 High/Scope: 4 Learning Accomplishment Profile: 1 Self-developed Skills Checklist 3</p>

**Collaborative Professional Development – Performance Measures – Refer to tool DD (B)
 (2006 Professional Development Funds that were carried forward into this fiscal year.)**

Note: Required measures to be reported are in bold.

Collaborators	Link to Which Comm. Plan Priority or Priorities (as noted in Section III)	How Much Was Invested? (Input Measures) Note: Fiscal Investments must coincide with fiscal report	How Much Was Done or Produced? (Output Measures)	How Well Did We Do It? (Quality/Efficiency Measures)	What Was the Change In Conditions for Those We Served? (Outcome Measures)
<p>Please list the collaborative partners involved in the professional Development Activities and briefly describe the activities.</p> <p>Northwest AEA, Sioux City Community School District</p> <p>Quality Preschool Programming Standards</p> <p>Participants attended the training session with a facilitator</p> <p>Participants completed a self-study of their classrooms</p> <p>Participants developed a plan of action.</p>	<p>1, 4</p>	<p>Amount Expended: \$12,165.54 (An additional \$1,779.03 was used from School Ready Balance for General Use to cover the extra costs of this program)</p> <p>(Report any other applicable input measures)</p>	<p><u>Total number of participants by:</u></p> <p>Number of Administrators/Directors: 6</p> <p>Number of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 5</p> <p>Number of Assistant Teachers: 2</p> <p>Report as applicable: Total number of credits earned: 4 Average number of credits earned by participants: 1 Total number of participant hours logged: 286 hours</p>	<p><u>Percent of all participants completing coursework by:</u></p> <p>Percent of Administrators/Directors: 100%</p> <p>Percent of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 100%</p> <p>Percent of Assistant Teachers: 100%</p> <p>Average cost per participant: \$540</p> <p><u>Report as applicable:</u></p> <p>Average cost per credit hour: \$25.00</p>	<p>Percent of participants who report incorporating learning into policy or practice:</p> <p>100% report improvements</p> <p>(Report any other applicable participant outcomes)</p> <p>Plans of action were implemented and will continue into next year.</p>

07 CEA AR Shell

Revised 2/22/07

Quality Improvement Funds – Performance Measures.

Please briefly describe the project or projects used with this funding.

Collaborators	Link to Which Comm. Plan Priority or Priorities (as noted in Section III)	How Much Was Invested? (Input Measures) Note: Fiscal Investments must coincide with fiscal report	How Much Was Done or Produced? (Output Measures)	How Well Did We Do It? (Quality/Efficiency Measures)	What Was the Change In Conditions for Those We Served? (Outcome Measures)
<p>07 CEA AR Shell Revised 2/22/07</p> <p>Please list the collaborative partners involved in the professional Development Activities and briefly describe the activities.</p> <p>Northwest AEA, University of Northern Iowa</p> <p>UNI Science Workshop</p> <p>This was a Science workshop for Early Childhood teachers focusing on water and sand play.</p>	<p>1, 4</p>	<p>Amount Expended: \$218.90</p> <p>(Report any other applicable input measures)</p>	<p><u>Total number of participants by:</u></p> <p>Number of Administrators/Directors: 6</p> <p>Number of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 24</p> <p>Number of Assistant Teachers: 4</p>	<p><u>Percent of all participants completing coursework by:</u></p> <p>Percent of Administrators/Directors: 90%</p> <p>Percent of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 90%</p> <p>Percent of Assistant Teachers: 50%</p> <p>Average cost per participant: \$6.66</p>	<p>Percent of participants who report incorporating learning into policy or practice:</p> <p>100% report improvements</p> <p>(Report any other applicable participant outcomes)</p> <p>Evaluations indicated great satisfaction and excitement to incorporate activities into lesson plans.</p>
<p>Please list the collaborative partners involved in the professional Development Activities and briefly describe the activities.</p> <p>Northwest AEA</p> <p>Every Child Reads</p> <p>Literacy training to personnel who work with children ages 3 to 5.</p>	<p>1, 4, 5</p>	<p>Amount Expended: \$4,371.47</p> <p>(Report any other applicable input measures)</p>	<p><u>Total number of participants by:</u></p> <p>Number of Administrators/Directors: 4</p> <p>Number of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 11</p> <p>Number of Assistant Teachers: 8</p> <p>Total number of participant hours: 44</p>	<p><u>Percent of all participants completing coursework by:</u></p> <p>Percent of Administrators/Directors: 100%</p> <p>Percent of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 100%</p> <p>Percent of Assistant Teachers: 100%</p> <p>Average cost per participant: \$350</p>	<p>Percent of participants who report incorporating learning into policy or practice:</p> <p>100% report improvements</p> <p>(Report any other applicable participant outcomes)</p> <p>Reported changes occurred in every program and some implemented more than a few things</p>
<p>Empowerment Coordinator</p> <p>Pays portion of coordinator's salary</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</p>	<p>\$34,478.02 empowerment funds,</p>	<p># of FTE employees: 1</p>	<p>% of salary and benefits paid by these funds 75%</p>	<p>% of empowerment programs managed by this position : 100% 33</p>

Collaborators	Link to Which Comm. Plan Priority or Priorities (as noted in Section III)	How Much Was Invested? (Input Measures) Note: Fiscal Investments must coincide with fiscal report	How Much Was Done or Produced? (Output Measures)	How Well Did We Do It? (Quality/Efficiency Measures)	What Was the Change In Conditions for Those We Served? (Outcome Measures)
<p>Please list the collaborative partners involved in the professional Development Activities and briefly describe the activities.</p> <p>Siouxland Community Health Center</p> <p>Child Care Nurse Consultant</p> <p>These funds were used to move the Child Care Nurse Consultant up to a full-time position. It had previously been funded at ½ time position, with funds from Early Childhood. .</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>\$44,938.92 empowerment funds, # FTE local child care nurse consultant: 1.0</p>	<p># CCNC contacts with child care: 1974</p> <p># hours spent on direct Child Care Nurse Consultant activities: 549.5</p> <p># and % increase formal Business Agreements between CCNC and child care providers. : 54 & 5.88%</p> <p># of Health & Safety Surveys from child care providers: 54</p> <p># of Injury prevention assessments: 41</p> <p>#of Child Record Reviews: 4</p> <p># of Health & Safety assessments: 1</p>	<p>% increase in contacts: 8.7%</p> <p>% increase in direct contact hours: 10.29%</p>	<p>% of change measured via improved score on Health & Safety Assessment: Not enough Health & Safety data completed to analyze this data for SFY07</p> <p>Increase the rate of child care businesses receiving the injury prevention checklist: Increase 46% of new injury prevention assessments completed in SFY07 compared to SFY06</p>

Other Services (other than targeted School Ready funds) - Performance Measures

For each service listed, in the first column, please provide a brief description of the program being supported.

School Ready Services Provided including a brief description of the program or activity (Coincide w/ Budget Line Items)	Link to Which Priority or Priorities	How Much Was Invested? (Input Measures) Note: Fiscal Investments must coincide with fiscal report	How Much Was Done or Produced? (Output Measures)	How Well Did We Do It? (Quality/ Efficiency Measures)	What Was the Change In Conditions for Those We Served? (Outcome Measures)
<p>Dolly Parton's Imagination Library (United Way of Siouxland)</p> <p>This program delivers a new, age-appropriate book to a child's doorstep each month from birth to 5.</p>	<p>1, 5</p>	<p>\$35,000 empowerment funds, # of HOPES / Head Start Families eligible for the program (not cumulative): 60</p>	<p>Total participants currently enrolled in program (cumulative since 2002): 1,765</p> <p>At-Risk / HOPES/ Head Start families who have participated in the program): 176</p> <p># of Parents' Survey received in 2006: 293 (1,700 distributed)</p>	<p>% Participants enrolled and considered at risk: 60%</p> <p>Participants with a rural address: 35%</p>	<p>% Parents/caregiver spending more time reading to their children: 94%</p> <p>% Parents/caregiver feel that the program is improving their relationship with one another: 94%</p> <p>% Parents/caregiver feel the program is increasing their child's interest in reading: 94%</p> <p>% Homes of participants having additional age-appropriate books: 100%</p>
<p>Oral Health Program</p> <p>This program</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>\$79,503 empowerment funds, # of full time dental hygienists 1.03 FTE</p>	<p># of articles, presentations and health fairs: 8</p>	<p>% of children accessing dental care following referral: 95%</p>	<p>% of children with evidence of untreated decay: 29%</p> <p>% of children with a dental home:</p>

<p>provides oral health education, screenings and fluoride applications to Woodbury County children, urban and rural, ages 0-5.</p>			<p># of oral health screenings: 1,266</p> <p># of oral health education presentations: 2,285</p> <p># of fluoride varnish applications: 1,210</p> <p># of total oral health contacts: 4,761</p>		<p>61%</p>
<p>Child Scholarships for In-Home Child Care</p> <p>This program offers scholarships to families with children at in-home child care providers. The State Empowerment Board approved this program to be funded with School Ready funds, on the condition that it is moved to Early Childhood in 2008.</p>	<p>1, 4, 5</p>	<p>\$71,153 empowerment funds, # of requests for scholarships: 62</p>	<p># of children receiving scholarships: 25</p> <p># of Parents' completing scholarship survey: 35</p>	<p>% parent scholarship surveys returned: 56%</p> <p>% of requests receiving scholarships: 54%</p>	<p>% of parents who feel scholarship helped them remain in workforce or school: 100%</p>

<p>Beyond the Bell Pre-K Jump Start Program</p> <p>Collaborative kindergarten transition program between empowerment, Beyond the Bell (after school program) and Sioux City Community School District</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>\$12,066.94 empowerment funds, \$23,800 other funds (Sioux City Community School District and DHS QRS grant)</p>	<p># of pre-k children enrolled in program: 112</p> <p># of pre-k classrooms: 8</p> <p># of students demonstrating kindergarten readiness at end of program: 62</p>	<p>% of capacity met: 62%</p> <p>% of students remaining in summer program for entire six weeks: 99%</p>	<p>% of children that demonstrated kindergarten readiness at program end: 55%</p>
<p>Sergeant Bluff-Luton Community School: Kindergarten Transition Summer Program</p> <p>Collaborative kindergarten transition program between empowerment and Sergeant Bluff-Luton School District</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>\$4,200 empowerment funds, \$2,000 Sgt. Bluff-Luton School District</p>	<p># of pre-k children enrolled in program: 25</p> <p># of pre-k classrooms: 1</p> <p># of students demonstrating kindergarten readiness at end of program: 22</p>	<p>% of capacity met: 83%</p> <p>% of students remaining in summer program for entire 4 weeks: 100%</p>	<p>% of children that demonstrated kindergarten readiness at program end: 88%</p>

Collaborators	Link to Which Comm. Plan Priority or Priorities (as noted in Section III)	How Much Was Invested? (Input Measures) Note: Fiscal Investments must coincide with fiscal report	How Much Was Done or Produced? (Output Measures)	How Well Did We Do It? (Quality/ Efficiency Measures)	What Was the Change In Conditions for Those We Served? (Outcome Measures)
<p>Please list the collaborative partners involved in the professional Development Activities and briefly describe the activities.</p> <p>CENTERING ON CENTERS CONFERENCE</p> <p>Northwest AEA,</p> <p>ABC Child Care Center</p> <p>Building Futures Child Center</p> <p>Early Childhood Learning Center</p> <p>Mary Elizabeth Daycare</p> <p>Native American Child Care Center,</p> <p>Roots & Wings Preschool</p> <p>Stella Sanford Child Development Center</p> <p>Storytime Preschool</p>	<p>1, 4</p>	<p>Amount Expended: \$7,669</p> <p>(Report any other applicable input measures)</p>	<p><u>Total number of participants by:</u></p> <p>Number of Administrators/Directors: 8</p> <p>Number of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 21</p> <p>Number of Assistant Teachers: 20</p> <p>Report as applicable: Total number of credits earned: 1 Average number of credits earned by participants: 6 Total number of participant hours logged: 686 hours</p>	<p><u>Percent of all participants completing coursework by:</u></p> <p>Percent of Administrators/Directors: 100%</p> <p>Percent of Teachers/Early Childhood Providers: 100%</p> <p>Percent of Assistant Teachers: 100%</p> <p>Average cost per participant: \$156.51</p>	<p>Percent of participants who report incorporating learning into policy or practice:</p> <p>100% were required to write an implementation plan</p> <p>(Report any other applicable participant outcomes)</p> <p>Statements of implementation are included on file at Northwest AEA.</p>
<p>Public Awareness</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</p>	<p>\$25,000 empowerment</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>% of funds expended: 100%</p>	<p>% of empowerment staff that felt</p>

<p>Funds are spent on board development, professional development for empowerment coordinator and SHIP director, advertising and marketing for empowerment (brochures, promotion), annual kindergarten surveys, etc.</p>		<p>dollars invested</p>			<p>the funds were used appropriate, to the benefit of the Woodbury County empowerment program: 100%</p>
---	--	--------------------------------	--	--	--

SECTION VII –Other Community Investment and Support

Identify and briefly describe other funding or support (as appropriate) the community empowerment area has been successful in obtaining and applying toward the community plan. *Identify funds (actual cash amount) that come directly to and flow through the community empowerment area to support the community plan. Identify value of in-kind as calculated according to usual and customary accounting principles (convert to cash value) that supports the community empowerment area’s community plan.*

Please refer to OMB circular A110 for more information regarding local match and in-kind www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a110/a110.html#23

Source	Cash Value	Source	In-Kind Cash Value
TOTAL		TOTAL	
