

Maine Head Start



State Collaboration Office Needs Assessment



2009 SURVEY RESULTS

Foreword and Acknowledgements

This Maine Head Start State Collaboration Needs Assessment report presents findings from a survey of staff and directors representing the 14 Head Start programs in Maine for the school years 2007-2009. The survey was given in January and February 2009, and was designed to gather information for a site-based assessment of Head Start programs with specific focus on cooperation, coordination and collaboration within the following nine key activity areas:

- Health care
- Children experiencing homelessness
- Welfare/child welfare
- Child care
- Family literacy services
- Children with disabilities and their families
- Community services
- Education (divided into publicly funded Pre-K partnership development and Head Start transition and alignment with K-12, and professional development)



John E. Baldacci, Governor

Brenda M. Harvey, Commissioner

This report was prepared by the Maine Head Start Collaboration Office. Development, production and distribution of the report were supported by funds from the Maine Head Start State Collaboration Grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, account number O13-10A-0545-B256-042. The content of this report does not represent the official position of the funding source. It was published in 2009.

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Study Design	
Study Objectives	3
Survey Instruments	3
Methodology	3
Number of Surveys Completed per Key Activity Area	4
Presentation of Findings	4
Key Activity Area 1: Health Care	
Health Care: Level of Involvement	4
Health Care: Level of Difficulty	5
Health Care: Other Issues	5
Health Care: Efforts that are Working Well	5
Key Activity Area 2: Children Experiencing Homelessness	
Children Experiencing Homelessness: Level of Involvement	6
Children Experiencing Homelessness: Level of Difficulty	6
Children Experiencing Homelessness: Other Issues	7
Children Experiencing Homelessness: Efforts that are Working Well	7
Key Activity Area 3: Welfare/ Child Welfare	
Welfare/ Child Welfare: Level of Involvement	8
Welfare/ Child Welfare: Level of Difficulty	8
Welfare/ Child Welfare: Other Issues	8
Welfare/ Child Welfare: Efforts that are Working Well	8
Key Activity Area 4: Child Care	
Child Care: Level of Involvement	9
Child Care: Level of Difficulty	9
Child Care: Other Issues	9
Child Care: Efforts that are Working Well	9
Key Activity Area 5: Family Literacy Services	
Family Literacy Services: Level of Involvement	10
Family Literacy Services : Level of Difficulty	11
Family Literacy Services: Other Issues	11
Family Literacy Services: Efforts that are Working Well	11
Key Activity Area 6: Children with Disabilities	
Children with Disabilities: Level of Involvement	11
Children with Disabilities: Level of Difficulty	11
Children with Disabilities: Other Issues	12
Children with Disabilities: Efforts that are Working Well	12
Key Activity Area 7: Community Services	
Community Services: Level of Involvement	13
Community Services: Level of Difficulty	13
Community Services: Other Issues	13
Community Services: Efforts that are Working Well	13
Key Activity Area 8A: Partnerships with Local Education Agencies	
Partnerships with Local Education Agencies: Level of Involvement	14
Partnerships with Local Education Agencies: Level of Difficulty	14
Partnerships with Local Education Agencies: Other Issues	14
Partnerships with Local Education Agencies: Efforts that are Working Well	15
Key Activity Area 8B: Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12	
Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12: Level of Involvement	15
Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12: Level of Difficulty	15
Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12: Other Issues	15
Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12: Efforts that are Working Well	16
Key Activity Area 9: Professional Development	
Professional Development: Level of Involvement	17
Professional Development: Level of Difficulty	17
Professional Development: Other Issues	17
Professional Development: Efforts that are Working Well	17
Maine Head Start Needs Assessment Survey Results Trends	
Trends regarding level of involvement with providers/organizations	18
Trends regarding level of difficulty with tasks involving key activity areas	20
Trends within the Key Activity Areas	23
Recommendations	25
Appendix A: Survey Results	26
Appendix B: Survey Instrument	49

Introduction

Overview of Head Start Program

Head Start is a national program “that promotes school readiness by enhancing the social and cognitive development of children through the provision of educational, health, nutritional, social and other services to enrolled children and families.” The program provides grants to local agencies, both public and private nonprofit, who in turn provide services to economically disadvantaged children from birth to age 5, expectant mothers and families (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ohs/about/>).

According to the publication “Head Start in Maine” published by the Maine State Head Start Collaboration Office, “Maine Head Start serves more than 4,000 children annually... Maine Head Start has been at the forefront in finding ways to deliver services to the State’s neediest children.” Maine Head Start programs bring innovation to their service delivery, offering a variety of program options. Early Head Start programs offer services to pregnant women and children birth to three and Head Start programs are available for children ages three through five. Program models include traditional part-day, part-year; full-day, full-year center-based care; home-based, combined-option family childcare partnerships; and public Pre-K collaborations.

Maine Head Start programs include:

- Waldo County Head Start
- Community Concepts, Inc.
- Aroostook County Community Action Program
- Penquis Community Action Program
- People’s Regional Opportunity Program (P.R.O.P.)
- Midcoast Maine Community Action
- Kennebec Valley Community Action Program
- Child & Family Opportunities, Inc.
- Androscoggin Head Start & Child Care
- York County Community Action
- Southern Kennebec Child Development Corporation
- Little Feathers Head Start
- Maliseet Head Start
- Passamaquoddy Head Start

Study Design

Study Objectives

The purpose of this survey project was to collect data from Head Start program staff for a needs assessment of Head Start programs in Maine. The project is in response to changes in Federal statute P.L. 100-134 entitled Improving Head Start for School Readiness, and aligns with collaborative efforts of the National Office of Head Start. The goal of the project was to conduct a site-based assessment of Head Start programs with specific focus on cooperation, coordination and collaboration within nine key activity areas. These nine activity areas are:

1. Health care
2. Children experiencing homelessness
3. Welfare/child welfare
4. Child care
5. Family literacy services
6. Children with disabilities and their families
7. Community services
8. Education (divided into 8A—publicly funded Pre-K partnership development, and 8B—Head Start transition and alignment with K-12)
9. Professional development

Survey Instruments

Ten separate surveys were developed, each representing one of the nine activity areas noted above. This was accomplished in collaboration with the National Office of Head Start. The surveys were pre-tested with two Head Start programs (one urban and one rural). Feedback from the pre-test was used to modify and finalize the survey instruments.

There were three main parts to the survey. First, data were gathered to identify the extent of involvement that each Head Start program has with various service providers and organizations by content area. A listing of possible agencies for interaction within each activity area was based on recommendations from the National Office of Head Start. A scale was developed to capture the range of involvement from “no working relationship” to a full “collaborative relationship.” The definitions of the range of involvement are as follows:

- Collaboration represents the greatest level of involvement, in which the Head Start agency shares resources and/or has formal, written agreements with the various providers or organizations. Examples of collaboration include co-funded staff or building costs, joint grant funding for a new initiative, or a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on transition.
- Coordination represents the next lower level of involvement, in which the Head Start agency works together on projects or activities with the various providers or organizations. Examples of coordination include parents from the service providers’ agency being invited to the

Head Start agency’s parent education night, or the service provider offering health screenings for the children at the Head Start agency’s site.

- Cooperation represents the lowest level of involvement, in which the Head Start agency exchanges information with the various providers or organizations. Examples of cooperation include making and receiving referrals.
- No working relationship represents no involvement between the Head Start agency and the various providers or organizations. They do not make referrals, do not work together on projects or activities, and do not share information.

Second, information was obtained regarding the level of difficulty each program has had engaging in each of the variety of tasks associated with the respective activity areas. A four-point scale was used to measure the level of difficulty which ranged from **not at all difficult** to **extremely difficult**.

Finally, open-ended questions were used to document any remaining concerns and to give respondents an opportunity to share insight about what is working well in their program.

Methodology

Surveys were emailed to the directors of Maine’s 14 Head Start programs. Since the responsibility for each of the nine activity areas is typically assigned to a different person within each Head Start program, 10 separate surveys were developed for the 10 parts of the nine activity areas to avoid response burden. The email explained the purpose of the survey and requested each Head Start director to distribute one set of the surveys to the appropriate people tasked with each activity. If a person was responsible for more than one activity area, they were to fill out each of the surveys that corresponded to their areas of responsibility. The directors were requested to fill out the surveys themselves. All surveys were returned to the Maine State Data Center for analysis.

In total, 30 responses were received from representatives of 10 of 14 Head Start programs in Maine. Titles of additional personnel taking the survey include the following:

- Operations Director
- Associate Director
- Program Director
- Education and Disabilities Coordinator
- Family & Community Partnership Manager
- Disabilities
- Support Services Manager
- Education and Disabilities Supervisor
- Head Start Manager
- Disabilities/Mental Health Manager
- Family Service Coordinator
- Program/Training Manager
- Health & Safety Coordinator
- Health & Nutrition Coordinator
- Content Lead Coordinator

Key Activity Area 1: Health Care

Number of Surveys Completed per Key Activity Area

Surveys were received from each of the 11 Maine Head Start programs. For each Key Activity Section of the survey, the following number of responses were received.

Area	Activity Area	Number of Surveys
Area 1	Health care	23
Area 2	Children experiencing homelessness	23
Area 3	Welfare/child welfare	20
Area 4	Child care	20
Area 5	Family literacy services	20
Area 6	Children with disabilities and their families	19
Area 7	Community services	18
Area 8	Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development	18
Area 8B	Education—Head Start transition and alignment with K-12	18
Area 9	Professional development	17

Presentation of Findings

A detailed review of the data responses for each key activity area is presented in the Survey Results section of the report. A summary and discussion of key findings are presented in the Trends and Recommendations section. Frequency distributions for each of the 10 surveys representing the nine activity areas are presented in the Appendix Tables and Survey Instruments section. All open-ended responses, including additional comments where applicable, are included as submitted with spelling and punctuation corrected.

Health Care: Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate the extent of their involvement with health care providers/ organizations (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination or collaboration**), and summarized the 23 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 9).

For every provider/organization, the majority of respondents said they had at least a **cooperative** level of involvement. Overall, the best relationships were with *Women, Infants, Children (WIC)*, with more than half of respondents reporting collaborative involvement, and *local agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment*, at just under half. Other providers/organizations most commonly reported as collaborative were *agencies/programs that conduct mental health screenings* (43.5 percent), and *dental home providers for treatment and care and children's health education providers*, both at 34.8 percent.

For each provider/organization, at least one respondent said they had **no working relationship at all**.

Provider/Organization	% Most Commonly Reported Level of Involvement
Parent health education providers	52.2% Cooperation
WIC (Women, Infants, Children)	52.2% Collaboration
Community Health Centers	47.8% Cooperation
Local agency/agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment services	47.8% Collaboration
Public health services	43.5% Cooperation
Agencies/programs that conduct mental health screenings	43.5% Collaboration
Programs/services related to children's physical fitness and obesity prevention	39.1% Cooperation
Other nutrition services (cooperative extension programs, university projects on nutrition, etc..)	39.1% Coordination
Medical home providers	39.1% Cooperation
Home-visiting providers	34.8% Cooperation
Children's health education providers (Child Care R & R, community-based training)	34.8% Collaboration
Dental home providers for treatment and care	34.8% Collaboration
State agency/agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment services	30.4% Cooperation

Health Care: Level of Difficulty

We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found tasks related to health care difficult (not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult or extremely difficult), and summarized the 23 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 10).

Of the 23 respondents who answered this question, more than three-fourths said they found *linking children to dental homes that serve young children* to be difficult or **extremely difficult**. This was the only task in which the majority of respondents answered **extremely difficult**.

There were two tasks which the majority of respondents said they found **not at all difficult**—*getting children enrolled in MaineCare*, at 60.9 percent, and *getting full representation and active commitment on Health Advisory Committees*, at 43.5 percent.

For every other task, the most common answer was **somewhat difficult**.

Two respondents (8.7 percent) found *getting children enrolled in MaineCare* to be **extremely difficult**.

Table 3: Percent of respondents reporting tasks related to health care as difficult or extremely difficult. (n=23)	
% of Respondents	Task
78.2%	Linking children to dental homes that serve young children
34.8%	Assisting families to get transportation to appointments
34.7%	Partnering with oral health professionals on oral-health related issues (hygiene, education, etc.)
30.4%	Assisting parents to communicate effectively with medical/dental providers
26%	Sharing data/information on children/families served jointly by Head Start and other agencies re: health care (lead screening, nutrition reports, home-visit reports, etc.)
21.7%	Exchanging information on roles and resources with medical, dental and other providers/ organizations regarding health care
21.7%	Getting full representation and active commitment on your Health Advisory Committee
21.7%	Partnering with medical professionals on health-related issues (screening, safety, hygiene, etc.)
17.4%	Linking children to medical homes
17.3%	Arranging coordinated services for children with special health care needs
8.7%	Getting children enrolled in MaineCare

Health Care: Other Issues

We asked respondents to describe any other issues they may have regarding health care for the children and families in their program, and received 14 responses as follows:

Dental Care

- There is a huge shortage of dentists in Maine who will accept Medicaid patients.
- We have only one dentist who will serve children with MaineCare. We also have limited mental health services for children and parents.
- Lack of access to dental health services for children on MaineCare.
- Dental providers not accepting MaineCare.
- One dentist in area who accepts Mainecare. Can not meet HeadStart time requirements, does not offer treatment.
- Difficulty finding dental providers willing to accept children with Medicaid.
- Lack of dentist in the Aroostook County area, and especially those accepting MaineCare.
- Completing dental exams—parents following through with making appointments and getting there.
- Access to oral health care continues to be the No. 1 issue families face.

Medical

- Physicians and medical are busy and do not or can not give time to consult. Our doctor, who is our health consultant, does not attend Health Services Advisory, and it is difficult to reach her by phone. Now with the new needed leads, doctors are not supporting this, making it difficult on Head Start and parents.
- Some difficulty with physicians respecting parent requests for two lead screenings.
- Getting children to receive a lead test from their PCP is somewhat difficult. Many doctors in the area do not feel it is necessary.
- Obtaining lead results for children over age 3 were not completed at age 12 months and 24 months.
- We have difficulty with the second lead screening.

Miscellaneous/Other

- Interpreter services.
- We also are looking at ways to support families to access services and support to address the issue of obesity in youth and families.

Health Care: Efforts that are Working Well

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts to address the health care needs of children and families in their programs were working well. We received 10 responses, as follows:

- Our collaboration work with the area dental clinic, in particular this year, has greatly impacted families' abilities

to access dental services for their children.

- Collaborations/partnerships with the physicians and CDS.
- Working with the local WIC office, which is part of our agency; working with the Cooperative Extension and linking parents to them for nutritional needs. Diabetes Educators—with diabetes on the rise, we have had success connecting with the diabetes educators for training and support.
- Agreements with dental providers willing to visit Head Start centers helps with preventative care.
- ACAP dental Hygienist is available to screen Head Start children/school partnership children.
- Home visitors have a good working relationship with doctors offices. Making the personal contact so when you speak to the office staff they know who you are and vice versa.
- Memoranda of understanding with three dental clinics. Memorandum of understanding with local hospital for on site lead screening, plus cooperation and support from others and a grant. Partnering with community resource agencies, such as Healthy Androscoggin, area hospitals, using resources from Health Advisory Committee members.
- Offering dental clinics on-site is a real positive, increasing the number of children who are seen by a dentist and who have an on-going dental home.
- We have a good relationship with two new-to-our-area pediatric dentists.
- We have a very active Health Advisory Committee. We also have some well-defined relationships with local health care providers and other programs that serve the same population we serve, such as our Healthy Maine Partner, Healthy Communities of the Capitol Area and Public Health Nursing.

Key Activity Area 2: Children Experiencing Homelessness

Children Experiencing Homelessness: Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate the extent of their involvement with providers/organizations serving children experiencing homelessness (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination or collaboration**) and summarized the 23 responses below. For more detailed responses, see Appendix A (Question 13).

More than half the respondents said they had **no working relationship** with their local Title I director (if Title I funds are being used), and one fewer reported no working relationship with their local McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act liaison.

Nine respondents, or slightly more than one-third, said they had **cooperative** relationships with local agencies serving families experiencing homelessness, and/or with local housing agencies and planning groups (like shelters).

Table 4: Level of involvement with providers/organizations serving children experiencing homelessness. (n=23)

Provider/ Organization	No Working Relationship (little/ contact)	Cooperation (exchange no info/ referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/ agreements)
Local McKinney- Vento liaison	52.5% (12)	30. % (7)	8.7% (2)	8.7% (2)
Local agencies serving families experiencing homelessness	13.0% (3)	39.1% (9)	34. % (8)	13.0% (3)
Local housing agencies and planning groups (e.g., shelters)	17.4% (4)	39.1% (9)	21.7% (5)	21.7% (5)
Title I Director*	56.5% (13)	26.1% (6)	4.3% (1)	13.0% (3)

*if Title I funds are being used to support early care and education programs for children experiencing homelessness

Children Experiencing Homelessness: Level of Difficulty

We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found tasks related to children experiencing homelessness difficult in the past 12 months (**not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult** or **extremely difficult**) and summarized the

23 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 14).

The bulk of respondents said they found each task either **not at all difficult** or **somewhat difficult**. The highest percentage (82.6 percent) said they found implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children experiencing homelessness are identified and prioritized for enrollment to be not at all difficult.

For each task, at least one respondent said they found it **extremely difficult** and one found it **not at all difficult**.

- Parents who wish to home school.
- Many families are choosing to combine households due to financial strain. This sometimes creates other stressors that we try to support families with.
- Full day care for children is needed for families experiencing homelessness.
- The mobility of families is challenging.

Children Experiencing Homelessness: Efforts that are Working Well

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts related to children and families experiencing homelessness are working well, and received seven responses as follows:

- We did have a great statewide training that helped build knowledge and resources—good old hard work by our family advocates is what helps our families connect with housing.
- We have always addressed this issue.
- Our transition to Integrated Family Services and having case management referrals for families who are homeless.
- MOU in place with Homeless Shelter.
- Connecting with reps from other agencies that can offer resources. Just getting prioritization to get into Head Start helps so that parents can start working or going to school and eventually get housing.
- Head Start to approach a shelter for resource and referral and to offer “Home Based” service at a minimum.
- We have a signed a cooperative agreement with York County Shelter. We have also included homeless families on our selection criteria giving them priority for enrollment.

Table 5: Percent of respondents who said each task related to children experiencing homelessness was difficult or extremely difficult. (n=23)

% of Respondents	Task
34.8%	Engaging community partners, including the local McKinney-Vento Liaison, in conducting staff cross training and planning activities
30.4%	In coordination with LEA, developing and implementing family outreach and support efforts under McKinney-Vento and transition planning for children experiencing homelessness
21.7%	Entering into an MOU with the appropriate local entity responsible for managing publicly funded preschool that includes a plan to coordinate selection priorities for eligible children, including children experiencing homelessness
21.7%	Obtaining sufficient data on the needs of homeless children to inform the program's annual community assessment
8.7%	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
8.7%	Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children experiencing homelessness are identified and prioritized for enrollment
8.7%	Aligning Head Start program definition of homelessness with McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

Children Experiencing Homelessness: Other Issues

We asked respondents to tell us any other issues they may have regarding services for children and families experiencing homelessness, and received five responses as follows:

- Our county has no resources to serve children experiencing homelessness—none—and the school liaisons don't work with us either.

Key Activity Area 3: Welfare/ Child Welfare

Welfare/Child Welfare: Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate the extent of their involvement with family/child assistance providers/organizations (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination or collaboration**) and summarized the 20 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 18).

For all six providers/agencies, a majority of respondents said they had at least a **cooperative** level of involvement. While 35 percent of respondents said they had no **working relationship** with economic and community development councils, almost as many cited cooperative relationships, and seven more cited **coordinating** or **collaborative** relationships.

TANF agency was the only provider/organization with which every single respondent said they had at least a **cooperative** relationship.

Table 6: Percentage of respondents and ranking of relationships with welfare/child welfare providers/organizations. (n=20)

Provider/Organization	Largest % of Respondents Ranking
Services & Networks supporting foster & adoptive families	50% Cooperation
TANF agency	50% Cooperation
Child Welfare Agency	45% Cooperation
Children's Trust Agency	35% Collaboration
Economic & Community Development Councils	35% No Working Relationship
Employment and Training and Labor Services	35% Cooperation 35% Collaboration

Welfare/Child Welfare: Level of Difficulty

We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found tasks related to welfare/child welfare difficult (**not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult or extremely difficult**) and summarized the 20 responses below.

For each task, the most commonly reported ranking was not at all difficult. For each task but two, at least 50 percent of respondents chose not at all difficult—the exceptions being *establishing and implementing local interagency partnerships or agreements* and *facilitating shared training and technical assistance opportunities*, both chosen by 45 percent of respondents.

An even 10 percent chose extremely difficult for every task.

Table 7: Most commonly reported level of difficulty with tasks related to child welfare. (n=20)

% of Respondents	Task
55% Not at all difficult	Obtaining information and data for community assessment and planning
60% Not at all difficult	Working together to target recruitment to families receiving TANF, Employment and Training, and related support services
80% Not at all difficult	Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children in the child welfare system are prioritized for enrollment
45% Not at all difficult	Establishing and implementing local interagency partnerships or agreements
45% Not at all difficult	Facilitating shared training and technical assistance opportunities
50% Not at all difficult	Getting involved in state level planning and policy development
50% Not at all difficult	Exchanging information on roles & resources with other service providers regarding family/child assistance services

Welfare/Child Welfare: Other Issues

We asked respondents to describe any other issues they may have related to welfare/child welfare for children and families in Head Start programs, and received two responses as follows::

- Extremely difficult at times to get someone to talk to us regarding agreements, training, etc. Once we speak to someone we have no problem working together.
- More families/situations are “screened out” by Child Protective Unit. Families have challenges when they adopt a child, as public benefits often end. Many families don't understand their status/responsibilities regarding TANF/ASPIRE.

Welfare/Child Welfare: Efforts that are Working Well

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts related to welfare/child welfare are working well, and received two responses as follows:

- When we make direct contact with people and develop relationships—ASPIRE, DHHS, CPS.
- State money for child care subsidies. Case-specific local relationship are sometimes working well. Lots of provider-to-provider networking/sharing.

Key Activity Area 4: Child Care

Child Care: Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate their involvement with child care providers/organizations (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination or collaboration**) and summarized the 20 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 22).

For each provider/organization, at least 65 percent of all respondents said they had at least a **coordinating** relationship.

The strongest level of involvement seemed to be with *state agencies for child care*, with 70 percent of respondents reporting a **collaborative** relationship.

For each provider/organization, the bulk of respondents said they had a **collaborative** relationship, except for *higher education programs/services/resources related to child care*, with which 40 percent of respondents said they had a **collaborative** relationship and 40 percent said they had a **coordinating** relationship.

Provider/Organization	No Working Relationship (little/contact)	Cooperation (exchange no info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)
State agency for Child Care	5 % (1)	10 % (2)	15 % (3)	70 % (14)
Child Care Resource & Referral agencies	5 % (1)	20 % (4)	25 % (5)	50 % (10)
Local child care programs for full-year, full-day services	10 % (2)	25 % (5)	15 % (3)	50 % (10)
State or regional policy/planning committees that address child care issues	20 % (4)	15 % (3)	30 % (6)	35 % (7)
Higher education programs/services/resources related to child care (e.g., lab schools, student interns, cross-training)	5 % (1)	15 % (3)	40 % (8)	40 % (8)

Child Care: Level of Difficulty

We asked respondents to rate the extent to which they found tasks related to child care to be difficult (**not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult or extremely difficult**) and summarized the 20 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 23).

For every task, the majority of respondents found them **not at all difficult** or **somewhat difficult**, and an even 10 percent found them **extremely difficult**. The largest percent-

age, 65 percent, said establishing linkages/partnerships with child care providers was not at all difficult

Table 9: Most commonly reported degree of difficult for tasks related to child care. (n=20)

% of Respondents Most commonly reported degree of difficulty	Task
65 % Not at all difficult	Establishing linkages/partnerships with child care providers
55 % Not at all difficult	Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding child care and community needs assessment
50 % Not at all difficult	Sharing data/information on children that are jointly served (assessments, outcomes, etc.)
50 % Somewhat difficult	Aligning policies and practices with other service providers
45 % Somewhat difficult	Assisting families to access full-day, full year services

Child Care: Other Issues

We asked respondents to describe any other issues they may have related to child care for children and families, and received five responses as follows:

- Long waiting lists for infant/toddler care in this area. Also, the lack of child care for children with disabilities.
- Scarce funds has made competition a big issue, especially with one local provider.
- The need for summer child care programs for low-income families.
- The regulations are so tight that the families that need us the most, just over the income guidelines, are being eliminated. This doesn't exactly support the working poor to be working.
- Lack of adequate resources; communication; state does not communicate regarding eligibility and payments; single parents do not have same access to subsidized funds as compared to dual-parent households.

Child Care: Efforts that are Working Well

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts to address child care that are working well, and received three responses as follows:

- We have been successful in securing additional funds for children with severe or multiple disabilities to attend our child care facilities.
- We have several good collaborations with local center and family child care providers
- Sub contracts—having the flexibility to provide services as needed.

Key Activity Area 5: Family Literacy Services

Family Literacy Services: Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate their involvement with family literacy service providers/ organizations (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination or collaboration**) and summarized the 20 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 26).

There was no discernible pattern to the responses to this question. The bulk of the responses fell within each possible category for at least one provider/organization. Most respondents said they had **no working relationship** with museums, *Even Start*, *Born to Read* and *Raising Readers*. Most said they had a **collaborative** involvement with parent education programs/services and higher education programs/services/resources related to family literacy.

For every other provider but one, most respondents said they had a **cooperative** involvement—the exception was services to promote parent/child literacy interactions, which was a tie between **cooperative, coordinated** and **collaborative** involvements.

Table 10 cont.: Level of involvement with family literacy service providers/organizations. (n=20)

Provider/Organization	Largest % of Respondents Ranking
Public/private sources that provide book donations or funding for books	35% Cooperation
Employment and Training Programs	35% Cooperation
Born to Read	30% No working relationship
Services to promote parent/child literacy interactions	30% Cooperation 30% Coordination 30% Collaboration
Dept. of Ed. Title I, Part A Family Literacy	30% Cooperation

Family Literacy: Level of Difficulty

We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found tasks related to family literacy to be difficult (**not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult** or **extremely difficult**) and summarized the 19 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 27).

The majority of respondents said they found these tasks to be **not at all difficult** or **somewhat difficult**. For every task, an even 10 percent of respondents found it **extremely difficult**.

Table 10: Level of involvement with family literacy service providers/organizations. (n=20)

Provider/Organization	Largest % of Respondents Ranking
Even Start	60% No working relationship
Museums	50% No working relationship
Public libraries	50% Cooperation
Raising Readers	45% No working relationship
School libraries	45% Cooperation
Parent education programs/ services	45% Collaboration
Adult Education	45% Cooperation
Reading Readiness programs	40% Cooperation
English Language Learner programs & services	40% Cooperation
Providers of services for children and families who are English language learners	35% Cooperation
Higher Education programs/services/resources related to family literacy (grant projects, student interns, cross-training, etc...)	35% Collaboration

Table 11: Most commonly reported level of difficulty for tasks related to family literacy. (n=19)

% of Respondents Most commonly reported degree of difficulty	Task
68.4% Not at all difficult	Incorporating family literacy into your program policies and practices
63.2% Somewhat difficult	Establishing linkages/partnerships with key local level organizations/ programs (other than libraries)
63.2% Somewhat difficult	Recruiting families to Family Literacy Services
57.9% Not at all difficult	Exchanging information with other providers/organizations regarding roles and resources related to family literacy
57.9% Somewhat difficult	Educating others (parents, the community) about the importance of family literacy
47.4% Not at all difficult	Establishing linkages/partnerships with key literacy providers
31.6% Extremely difficult	Coordination with Even Start

Family Literacy: Other Issues

We asked respondents to describe other issues they may have related to family literacy for children and families in Head Start programs, and received two responses as follows:

- No Even Start Program.
- Upcoming focus on Health Literacy; difficult for parents to attend Adult Ed (time commitment, child care, transportation).

Family Literacy:

Efforts that are Working Well

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts to address needs related to family literacy that are working well, and received two responses as follows:

- Working with local libraries. Having our own lending library in conjunction with speakers talking to families—how to read pictures if words are difficult, importance of engaging child and turning pages.
- Grants/training initiatives—MEFLI, SPARC. Links with Adult Ed regarding family literacy. Lots of local classroom strategies (scholastic, lending library, book bags, etc.)

Key Activity Area 6: Children with Disabilities

Children with Disabilities: Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate their involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination or collaboration**) and summarized the 19 responses below. For more detailed information, please see Appendix A (Question 30).

For every provider/organization, the bulk of the respondents said they had **coordinating** or **collaborative** levels of involvement. For every provider/organization except two, some respondents said they had **no working relationship**—the exceptions were *state Child Development Services for children 3-5* and *regional CDS agencies for children 3-5*.

For the latter, the overwhelming majority of respondents (84.2 percent) said they had **collaborative** levels of involvement.

Table 12: Levels of involvement with providers/organizations related to children with disabilities. (n=19)

Provider/Organization	Largest % of Respondents Ranking
Regional CDS agencies for children 3-5	84.2% Collaboration
State Child Development Services (CDS) for children 3-5 (Lead Agency for Part B/619)	63.2% Collaboration
Regional CDS Agencies for children 0-3	57.9% Collaboration
State CDS for children 0-3 (State lead agency for Part C)	42.1% Collaboration
Federally funded programs for families of children with disabilities (Maine Parent Federation, Maine Disability Rights Center, GEAR, Maternal and Child Health, Special Medical Services, etc.)	36.8% Collaboration
State Education Agency—other programs/services (Section 504, special projects re: children with disabilities)	36.8% Coordination
State-funded programs for children with disabilities and their families (developmental services agencies)	36.8% Collaboration
University/community college programs/services related to children with disabilities (Center for Community Inclusion and Disability Studies)	36.8% Cooperation 36.8% Collaboration
Non-Head Start councils, committees or work groups that address policy/program issues regarding children with disabilities (Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, Maine's Expanding Inclusive Opportunities Initiative)	31.6% Collaboration

Children with Disabilities: Level of Difficulty

We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found tasks related to children with disabilities difficult (**not at all difficult**, **somewhat difficult**, **difficult** or **extremely difficult**) and summarized the 19 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 31).

For each task, the majority of respondents said they found it **not at all difficult**, except for *obtaining timely evaluations of children*, which a majority found **somewhat difficult**, and *having staff attend IEP or IFSP meetings*, which the majority split evenly between **not at all difficult** and **somewhat difficult**.

For every task, at least two respondents said they found it **extremely difficult**.

Table 13: Most commonly reported degree of difficult for tasks related to children with disabilities. (n=19)

% of Respondents Most commonly reported degree of difficulty	Task
63.2% Not at all difficult	Sharing data/information on jointly served children (assessments, outcomes, etc.)
57.9% Not at all difficult	Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding services for children with disabilities and their families
57.9% Not at all difficult	Coordinating services with Part C providers (CDS 0-3)
57.9% Somewhat difficult	Obtaining timely evaluations of children
52.6% Not at all difficult	Coordinating services with Part B/619 providers (CDS 3-5)
42.1% Not at all difficult 42.1% Somewhat difficult	Having staff attend IEP or IFSP meetings

- Due to more restrictive eligibility criteria we are having to go outside the CDS system to get recommended services for young children. Three-to-5 year old children are not like school age children; they are developing, not studying.

Children with Disabilities: Efforts that are Working Well

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts related to children with disabilities are working well, and received four responses as follows:

- Relationship with local CDS—ongoing and open communication.
- Because of the need, we have had successes with having the FSWs take the lead in finding services for families.
- We have a great working relationship with our local CDS and ongoing participation on their Board of Directors.
- Part C works well. Helping parents advocate for needed services through pediatricians and private OT, PT and Speech and Language Providers.

Children with Disabilities: Other Issues

We asked respondents to describe any other issues they may have regarding children with disabilities, and received two responses as follows:

- We have very poor turnaround time once we refer children. We often feel we are hounding our CDS people to see where things are. More and more our FSWs are making appointments and assuring that evaluations are happening. We have very limited providers, so often once a child is diagnosed they may be put on a waiting list for services. In our experience the Center of Community Inclusion has not been responsive to our needs.

Key Activity Area 7: Community Services

Community Services: Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate the extent of their involvement with community service providers/ organizations (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination or collaboration**). For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 34).

For every provider/organization, the majority of respondents said they had at least a **cooperative** relationship. The only provider/organization with which the bulk of respondents said they had a **collaborative** relationship was providers of child abuse prevention/treatment services, for which the majority said they had at least a coordinating relationship.

Nearly one quarter of respondents (22.2 percent) said they had no working relationship with law enforcement.

Table 14: Level of involvement with service providers/organizations related to community services. (n=18)

Provider/ Organization	No Working Relationship (little/ contact)	Cooperation (exchange no info/ referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/ agreements)
Law Enforcement	22.2%	38.9%	33.3%	5.6%
Providers of substance abuse prevention/treatment services	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%
Providers of child abuse prevention/ treatment services	5.6%	22.2%	33.3%	38.9%
Providers of domestic violence prevention/ treatment services	5.6%	33.3%	33.3%	27.8%
Private resources geared toward prevention/intervention (faith-based, business, foundations, shelters, etc.)	16.7%	33.3%	22.2%	27.8%
Providers of emergency services (Red Cross, state agency responsible for large-scale emergency plans)	16.7%	33.3%	22.2%	27.8%

Community Services: Level of Difficulty

We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found tasks related to community service difficult (**not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult or extremely difficult**) and summarized the 18 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 35).

For every task but two, the bulk of respondents indicated **some difficulty**. The exceptions were establishing linkages/partner-

ships with public resources, and obtaining in-kind community services for children and families, which were split between **somewhat difficult** and **not at all difficult**.

For every task, one respondent indicated **extreme difficulty**.

Table 15: Level of difficulty with tasks related to community services. (n=18)

% of Respondents Most commonly reported degree of difficulty	Task
66.7% Somewhat difficult	Establishing linkages/partnerships with law enforcement agencies
55.6% Somewhat difficult	Sharing data/information on children/families served jointly by Head Start and other agencies re: prevention/treatment services
50.0% Somewhat difficult	Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/ organizations regarding community services
50.0% Somewhat difficult	Partnering with service providers on outreach activities for eligible families
50.0% Somewhat difficult	Establishing linkages/partnerships with private resources (e.g., faith-based, foundations, business) regarding prevention/treatment services
44.4% Somewhat difficult 44.4% Not at all difficult	Obtaining in-kind community services for the children/families in your program
44.4% Not at all difficult 44.4% Somewhat difficult	Establishing linkages/partnerships with public resources (state, county, city, etc.) regarding prevention/treatment services

Community Services: Other Issues

We asked respondents to describe any other issues they may have regarding community services, and received one response as follows:

- Lots of changes in scope/personnel due to funding changes (cutbacks). Access can be difficult (costs, transportation). More difficult as areas get more rural in nature.

Community Services: Efforts that are Working

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts related to community services were working well, and received two responses, as follows:

- This community (Androscoggin County) networks very well. We share resources on a regular basis.
- Great partnerships with schools. Ongoing relationship building—meetings, communications, etc.

Key Activity Area 8A: Partnerships with Local Education Agencies

Local Education Agencies: Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate the extent of their involvement with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination or collaboration**). For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 38).

The LEA was described as follows:

Memorandum of Understanding 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), and a review of each of the activities.

Of the 18 respondents who answered the question, the overwhelming majority said they had **collaborative** involvement.

Extent of Relationship	% Respondents (n)
Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	72.2% (13)
Coordination (work together)	16.7% (3)
Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	5.6% (1)
No working relationship (little/no contact)	5.6% (1)

Local Education Agencies: Level of Difficulty

Head start programs are required to have an MOU with publicly funded Pre-K programs in their service areas. The MOU must include a review of, and plans to coordinate, as appropriate, 10 areas/activities. We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found each area/activity difficult (**not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult or extremely difficult**). For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 39).

For each task, the bulk of respondents answered either somewhat or not at all difficult—for two tasks, (information, dissemination and access for families contacting Head Start or other preschool program, and provision of services to meet needs of working parents, as applicable) the bulk of the answers were evenly split between somewhat and not at all difficult.

For each task, at least one respondent said they found it **extremely difficult**.

Table 17: Level of difficulty with tasks related to Local Education Agencies. (n=18)

Task	% of Respondents Most commonly reported degree of difficulty
Communications and parent outreach for transition to kindergarten	66.7 % Not at all difficult
Educational activities, curricular objectives and instruction	61.1 % Somewhat difficult
Other elements mutually agreed to by the parties to the MOU	55.6 % Somewhat difficult
Selection priorities for eligible children served	55.6 % Not at all difficult
Program technical assistance	50.0 % Somewhat difficult
Staff training, including opportunities for joint staff training	50.0 % Not at all difficult
Provision and use of facilities, transportation, etc...	44.4 % Not at all difficult
Service areas	44.4 % Not at all difficult
Information, dissemination and access for families contacting Head Start or other preschool program	44.4 % Not at all difficult 44.4 % Somewhat difficult
Provision of services to meet needs of working parents, as applicable	33.3 % Not at all difficult 33.3 % Somewhat difficult

Local Education Agencies: Other Issues

We asked respondents to describe any other issues they may have related to Local Education Agencies, and received seven responses as follows:

- Failure of public schools to meet federal transportation regulations for transporting young children.
- Schools still don't understand working with 4-year-olds and have expectations that do not comply with Head Start standards.
- Meeting health and dental requirements
- Most of them have not been very open. We have had partnerships and we have struggled with different philosophies. This area has had Pre-K longer than any other area and with no mandates to collaborate, so trying to get a foot in the door was difficult.
- We serve two counties with multiple school districts. One large district is a Pre-K partner. Others are not. Answers above reflect the partnership.
- Need to orient the programs—learn first about our policies before developing a partnership.
- Space, DOE transportation requirement, decreasing revenue.

Local Education Agencies: Efforts that are Working Well

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts related to Local Education Agencies are working well. We received five responses, as follows:

- Some schools have been willing to develop partnership Pre-K programs. Others have been willing to work on staff development and curriculum sharing.
- We have MOUs with three districts to provide public Pre-K programming—full-day Pre-K (six hours per day, four days per week) solves the transportation issue.
- We have been partnering and we continue to try and partner with new schools. Our Dyer Brook Collaborative has been going very well. We took a year to plan and team-build prior to starting the program and I think that has been key. The new mandate for the MOUs has certainly opened the doors, also, so we are hopeful we will be able to build some more partnerships.
- Meetings are planned to share information.
- Public School observations of Head Start; Share data about community demographics; start with relationship-building and operate Head Start standalone year one, then co-complete DOE application.

Key Activity Area 8B: Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12

LEAs, Transition and Alignment:

Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate the extent of their involvement with LEAs regarding transition from Head Start to Kindergarten (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination** or **collaboration**), and summarized the 18 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 42).

An even half (nine) said they had **collaborative** involvement with LEAs. Another 22.2 percent (four) said they had **coordinating** involvement, and 27.8 percent (five) said they had **cooperative** involvement.

None said they had **no working relationship**.

Table 18: Level of involvement with LEAs regarding transition from Head Start. (n=18)

Task	% of Respondents Involvement
Relationship with LEAs during the past 12 months regarding transition from Head Start to Kindergarten	0.0% No working relationship
	27.8% Cooperating relationship
	22.2% Coordinating relationship
	50.0% Collaborative relationship

LEAs, Transition and Alignment:

Level of Difficulty

We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found tasks related to transition and alignment from Head Start to Kindergarten difficult (**not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult** or **extremely difficult**), and summarized the 18 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 43).

For each task, the bulk of respondents said they had a **somewhat difficult** or **not at all difficult** degree of difficulty except for three, *partnering with LEAs and parents to assist individual children/families to transition to school (including review of portfolio/records), coordinating transportation with LEAs, and coordinating with LEAs to implement systematic procedures for transferring Head Start program records to school*, which were split evenly between both answers.

For each task, at least one respondent said they found it **extremely difficult**.

LEAs, Transition and Alignment: Other Issues

We asked respondents to describe any other issues they may have regarding LEAs and transition from Head Start to Kindergarten, and received three responses as follows:

- This was hard to answer because we have no difficulty working with SAD 3 and 22, but 34 is a different story. One big area is enrollment/selection criteria. We're working on it, however.
- This agency has 14 school districts in its catchment area, and areas of cooperation are very good with some districts and limited with others.
- Kindergarten teacher time is limited. Shared Pre-K/Kindergarten classroom is a challenge.

LEAs, Transition and Alignment: Efforts that are Working Well

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts to address transitions from Head Start to Kindergarten are working well. We received 10 responses, as follows:

- What works well is when Kindergarten teachers visit the 4-year-old classrooms prior to the end of the Head Start school year.
- We have staff fill out developmental summaries on each child going into kindergarten. The parents review form with teacher, then teachers meet with members of receiving districts over a two-day period. Very planned, organized and helpful!
- Co-location in public school (Kindergarten wing). Head Start to meet with public school personnel—i.e. literacy coordinator, curriculum coordinator—to begin aligning.

Table 19: Level of difficulty with tasks related to Local Education Agencies. (n=18)

Task	% of Respondents Most commonly reported degree of difficulty
Aligning Head Start curricula with state Early Learning Standards	77.8% Not at all difficult
Aligning curricula and assessment practices with LEAs	72.2% Somewhat difficult
Coordinating shared use of facilities with LEAs	72.2% Somewhat difficult
Establishing and implementing comprehensive transition policies and procedures with LEAs	72.2% Somewhat difficult
Coordinating with LEAs regarding other support services for children and families	66.7% Somewhat difficult
Ongoing communication with LEAs to facilitate coordination of programs (including teachers, social workers, McKinney Vento liaisons, etc.)	61.1% Somewhat difficult
Organizing and participating in joint training, including transition-related training for school staff and Head Start staff	55.6% Somewhat difficult
Establish policies and procedures that support children transition to school that includes engagement with LEA	55.6% Somewhat difficult
Conducting joint outreach to parents and LEA to discuss needs of children entering kindergarten	55.6% Somewhat difficult
Exchanging information with LEAs on roles, resources and regulations	50.0% Somewhat difficult
Helping parents of limited English proficient children understand instructional and other information and services provided by the receiving school.	50.0% Somewhat difficult
Aligning LEA and Head Start curricula and assessments with Head Start Child Outcomes Framework	50.0% Not at all difficult
Linking LEA and Head Start services relating to language, numeracy and literacy	50.0% Somewhat difficult
Coordinating with LEAs to implement systematic procedures for transferring Head Start program records to school	44.4% Not at all difficult 44.4% Somewhat difficult
Partnering with LEAs and parents to assist individual children/families to transition to school, including review of portfolio/records	38.9% Not at all difficult 38.9% Somewhat difficult
Coordinating transportation with LEAs	33.3% Not at all difficult 33.3% Somewhat difficult

Key Activity Area 9: Professional Development

Professional Development: Level of Involvement

We asked respondents to rate the extent of their involvement with professional development providers/organizations (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination or collaboration**), and summarized the 17 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 46).

For each provider/organization, the majority of respondents said they had at least a **cooperative** involvement. For two—child care resource and referral network and Head Start T and TA network—the bulk of respondents said they had **collaborative** involvements, the latter being a majority of 70.6 percent.

Every respondent said they had at least **cooperative** involvement with the Head Start T and TA network, less than four years with institutions of higher education, and with service providers/organizations offering relevant training/TA cross-training opportunities.

Table 20: Level of involvement with professional development service providers/organizations. (n=17)

Service Provider/Organization	% of Respondents Most commonly reported degree of difficulty
Head Start T & TA Network	70.6% Collaboration
Service providers/organizations offering relevant training/TA cross-training opportunities	47.1% Coordination
Other T & TA networks (regional, state)	47.1% Coordination
Child Care Resource & Referral Network	47.1% Collaboration
On-line courses/programs	47.1% Cooperation
Institutions of Higher Education (four-year)	47.1% Coordination
Institutions of Higher Education (less than four-year—i.e., community colleges)	41.3% Cooperation

Professional Development: Level of Difficulty

We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found tasks related to professional development difficult (**not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult or extremely difficult**), and summarized the 17 responses below. For more detailed responses, please see Appendix A (Question 47).

For each task, the bulk of respondents said they had a **somewhat difficult** degree of difficulty except for one,

accessing T and TA opportunities in the community, which they found **not at all difficult**.

That was also the only task that no respondent found **extremely difficult**.

Table 21: Level of difficulty with tasks related to professional development. (n=17)

Task	% of Respondents Most commonly reported degree of difficulty
Accessing scholarships and other financial support for professional development programs/activities	70.6% Somewhat difficult
Transferring credits between public institutions of learning	58.8% Somewhat difficult
Accessing T & TA opportunities in the community (including cross-training)	52.9% Not at all difficult
Staff release time to attend professional development activities	47.1% Somewhat difficult
Accessing early childhood education degree programs in the community	41.2% Somewhat difficult

Professional Development: Other Issues

We asked respondents to describe any other issues they may have regarding professional development, and received five responses as follows:

- Our RDC is not particularly active in Waldo County.
- Financial Assistance for some staff is difficult, as they fall just above income guidelines.
- Our local community college has been wonderful in responding to our need for ECE and accepting credits and work experience. Our local university does not have an ECE program and has not responded to the need for a four-year degree. It is very difficult to transfer credits to the university also making is very challenging for our staff who have gotten their AA to go on locally.
- Staff coverage—cost.
- More resources are needed! More ITV coursework needed. Supervision training is needed.

Professional Development: Efforts that are Working Well

We asked respondents to tell us what efforts related to professional development were working well, and received four responses as follows:

- Department of Labor Apprenticeship Program.
- The local community college has started dialogue with the university to try and break down some barriers. The community college has also worked closely with us to support our staff on their pursuit of higher education.
- Lots of communication; clarity of mandates; offering paid courses.
- Degree stipends are a staff motivator.

Maine Head Start Needs Survey Results Trends

Trends regarding level of involvement with providers/organizations

Throughout the survey, we asked respondents to rate the extent of their involvement (**no working relationship, cooperation, coordination** or **collaboration**) with several providers/organizations for each of the key activity areas. Looking at the results across all of the activity areas, we found several providers/organizations with which at least one-fourth of respondents indicated their Head Start agencies have **no working relationship**, meaning little or no contact. Those results appear in the table below.

We found that an even larger percentage of all respondents—at least half—reported having **no working relationship** with Even Start (60 percent), Title I Director if Title I funds are

being used to support early care and education programs for children experiencing homelessness (56.6 percent), the local McKinney-Vento Liaison (52.2 percent) or museums (50 percent).

The greatest level of involvement respondents could indicate is a **collaborative** relationship, in which resources are shared and there may be formal, written agreements. There are many providers/organizations across the key activity areas with which at least one-third of respondents indicated their Head Start agencies have a **collaborative** relationship. Those results appear in the table below.

An even greater percentage of all respondents—at least half—reported having **collaborative** relationships with the following providers/organizations:

Table 22: No working relationship between Head Start agencies and providers/organizations.

% of Respondents	Provider/Organization	Key Activity Area
60.0%	Even Start	Area 5: Family literacy services
56.5%	Title I Director, if Title I funds are being used to support early care and education programs for children experiencing homelessness	Area 2: Children and their families experiencing homelessness
52.2%	Local McKinney-Vento Liaison	Area 2: Children and their families experiencing homelessness
50.0%	Museums	Area 5: Family literacy services
45.0%	Raising Readers	Area 5: Family literacy services
35.0%	Economic and Community Development Councils	Area 3: Welfare/Child welfare
30.0%	Born to Read	Area 5: Family literacy services
30.0%	English Language Learner programs and services	Area 5: Family literacy services
26.1%	State agency(ies) providing mental health prevention and treatment services	Area 1: Health care
25.0%	Providers of services for children and families who are English language learners (ELL)	Area 5: Family literacy services
25.0%	Reading Readiness Programs	Area 5: Family literacy services
25.0%	Dept. of Ed Title 1, Part A, Family Literacy	Area 5: Family literacy services
25.0%	Children's Trust Agency	Area 3: Welfare/Child welfare

Table 23: Collaborative level of involvement between Head Start agencies and providers/organizations.

% of Respondents	Provider/Organization	Key Activity Area
84.2%	Regional CDS Agencies for children 3-5 years of age	Area 6: Children with Disabilities
72.2%	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), and a review of each of the activities.	Area 8A: Partnerships with Local Education Agencies
70.6%	Head Start T & TA Network	Area 9: Professional Development
70.0%	State agency for Child Care	Area 4: Child Care
63.2%	State Child Development Services (CDS)for children 3-5 (Lead Agency for Part B/619)	Area 6: Children with Disabilities
57.9%	Regional CDS Agencies for children 0-3	Area 6: Children with Disabilities
52.2%	WIC (Women, Infants Children)	Area 1: Health Care
50.0%	Relationship with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) regarding transition from Head Start to kindergarten	Area 8B: Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12
50.0%	Local child care programs for full-year, full-day services	Area 4: Child Care
50.0%	Child Care Resource & Referral agencies	Area 4: Child Care
47.8%	Local agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment	Area 1: Health Care
47.1%	Child Care Resource & Referral Network	Area 9: Professional Development
45.0%	Parent education programs/services	Area 5: Family Literacy Services
43.5%	Agencies/programs that conduct mental health screenings	Area 1: Health Care
42.1%	State CDS for children 0-3 (State Lead Agency for Part C)	Area 6: Children with Disabilities
40.0%	Higher education programs/services/resources related to child care (e.g., lab schools, student interns, crosstraining)	Area 4: Child Care
40.0%	Child Welfare agency	Area 3: Welfare/Child welfare
38.9%	Providers of child abuse prevention/treatment services	Area 7: Community Services
36.8%	University/community college programs/services related to children with disabilities (e.g., Center for Community Inclusion and Disability	Area 6: Children with Disabilities
36.8%	Studies)State-funded programs for children with disabilities and their families (e.g., developmental services agencies)	Area 6: Children with Disabilities
36.8%	Federally funded programs for families of children with disabilities (e.g., Maine Parent Federation, Maine Disability Rights Center, GEAR, Maternal and Child Health, Special Medical Services, etc.)	Area 6: Children with Disabilities
35.0%	Higher education programs/services/resources related to family literacy (e.g., grant projects, student interns, crosstraining, etc.)	Area 5: Family Literacy Services
35.0%	State or regional policy/planning committees that address child care issues	Area 4: Child Care
35.0%	Children's Trust agency	Area 3: Welfare/Child welfare
35.0%	Employment & Training and Labor services agencies	Area 3: Welfare/Child welfare
35.0%	TANF Agency	Area 3: Welfare/Child welfare
34.8%	Children's health education providers (e.g., Child Care R&R, community-based training)	Area 1: Health Care
34.8%	Other nutrition services (e.g., cooperative extension programs, university projects on nutrition, etc.)	Area 1: Health Care
34.8%	Dental home providers for treatment and care	Area 1: Health Care

Trends regarding level of difficulty with tasks involving the key activity areas

We asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they found each task relating to key activity areas difficult (not at all difficult, somewhat difficult, difficult, extremely difficult).

There are many tasks across the key activity areas with which at least one-third of respondents indicated the task has been not at all difficult. They appear in the table below.

An even greater percentage of respondents—at least three-quarters—said they found the following four tasks to be not at all difficult:

- implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children experiencing homelessness are identified and prioritized for enrollment (82.6 percent)
- implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children in the child welfare system are prioritized for enrollment (80 percent)
- 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 (78.3 percent)
- aligning Head Start curricula with state Early Learning Standards (77.8 percent)

Table 24: Tasks which Head Start agencies said were not at all difficult.

% of Respondents	Task	Key Activity Area
82.6%	Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children experiencing homelessness are identified and prioritized for enrollment	Area 2: Children Experiencing Homelessness
80.0%	Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children in the child welfare system are prioritized for enrollment	Area 3: Welfare/child welfare
78.3%	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	Area 2: Children Experiencing Homelessness
77.8%	Aligning Head Start curricula with state Early Learning Standards	Area 8B: Education—Head Start transition and alignment with K-12
69.6%	Aligning Head Start program definition of homelessness with McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act	Area 2: Children Experiencing Homelessness
68.4%	Incorporating family literacy into your program policies and practices	Area 5: Family literacy services
66.7%	Communications and parent outreach for transition to kindergarten	Area 8A: Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development
66.0%	Working together to target recruitment to families receiving TANF, Employment and Training, and related support services	Area 3: Welfare/child welfare
65.0%	Establishing linkages/partnerships with child care providers	Area 4: Child care
63.2%	Sharing data/information on jointly served children (assessments, outcomes, etc.)	Area 6: Children with disabilities and their families
60.9%	Getting children enrolled in MaineCare	Area 1: Health Care
57.9%	Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding services for children with disabilities and their families	Area 6: Children with disabilities and their families
57.9%	Coordinating services with Part C providers (CDS 0-3)	Area 6: Children with disabilities and their families
57.9%	Exchanging information with other providers/organizations regarding roles and resources related to family literacy	Area 5: Family literacy services
55.6%	Selection priorities for eligible children served	Area 8A: Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development
55.0%	Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding child care and community needs assessment	Area 4: Child care

Table 24 cont.: Tasks which Head Start agencies said were not at all difficult.

% of Respondents	Task	Key Activity Area
55.0%	Obtaining information and data for community assessment and planning	Area 3: Welfare/child welfare
52.9%	Accessing T & TA opportunities in the community (including crosstraining)	Area 9: Professional Development
52.6%	Coordinating services with Part B/619 providers (CDS 3-5)	Area 6: Children with disabilities and their families
50.0%	Aligning LEA and Head Start curricula and assessments with Head Start Child Outcomes Framework	Area 8B: Education—Head Start transition and alignment with K-12
50.0%	Staff training, including opportunities for joint staff training	Area 8A: Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development
50.0%	Sharing data/information on children that are jointly served (assessments, outcomes, etc.)	Area 4: Child care
50.0%	Exchanging information on roles & resources with other service providers regarding family/ child assistance services	Area 3: Welfare/child welfare
50.0%	Getting involved in state level planning and policy development	Area 3: Welfare/child welfare
47.4%	Establishing linkages/partnerships with key literacy providers	Area 5: Family literacy services
45.0%	Facilitating shared training and technical assistance opportunities	Area 3: Welfare/child welfare
45.0%	Establishing and implementing local interagency partnerships agreements	Area 3: Welfare/child welfare
44.4%	Coordinating with LEAs to implement systematic procedures for transferring Head Start program records to school	Area 8B: Education—Head Start transition and alignment with K-12
44.4%	Provision and use of facilities, transportation, etc.	Area 8A: Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development
44.4%	Program technical assistance	Area 8A: Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development
44.4%	Service areas	Area 8A: Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development
44.4%	Information, dissemination and access for families contacting Head Start or other preschool program	Area 8A: Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development
44.4%	Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding community services	Area 7: Community services
44.4%	Obtaining in-kind community services for the children/families in your program	Area 7: Community services
44.4%	Partnering with service providers on outreach activities for eligible families	Area 7: Community services
44.4%	Establishing linkages/partnerships with public resources (state, county, city, etc.) regarding prevention/treatment services	Area 7: Community services
43.5%	Getting full representation and active commitment on your Health Advisory Committee	Area 1: Health Care
42.1%	Having staff attend IEP or IFSP meetings	Area 6: Children with disabilities and their families
38.9%	Partnering with LEAs and parents to assist individual children/families to transition to school, including review of portfolio/records	Area 8B: Education—Head Start transition and alignment with K-12
38.9%	Linking LEA and Head Start services relating to language, numeracy and literacy	Area 8B: Education—Head Start transition and alignment with K-12
38.9%	Other elements mutually agreed to by the parties to the MOU	Area 8A: Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development

Table 24 cont.: Tasks which Head Start agencies said were not at all difficult.

% of Respondents	Task	Key Activity Area
38.9%	Sharing data/information on children/families served jointly by Head Start and other agencies re: prevention/treatment services	Area 7: Community services
35.0%	Assisting families to access full-day, full-year services	Area 4: Child care
34.8%	Obtaining sufficient data on the needs of homeless children to inform the program's annual community assessment	Area 2: Children Experiencing Homelessness
34.8%	Exchanging information on roles and resources with medical, dental and other providers/ organizations regarding health care	Area 1: Health Care
34.8%	Partnering with medical professionals on health-related issues (e.g., screening, safety, hygiene, etc.)	Area 1: Health Care
34. %	Linking children to medical homes	Area 1: Health Care
33.3%	Conducting joint outreach to parents and LEA to discuss needs of children entering kindergarten	Area 8B: Education—Head Start transition and alignment with K-12
33.3%	Coordinating transportation with LEAs	Area 8B: Education—Head Start transition and alignment with K-12
33.3%	Provision of services to meet needs of working parents, as applicable	Area 8A: Education—Publicly funded Pre-K partnership development
33.3%	Establishing linkages/partnerships with private resources (e.g., faith-based, foundations, business) regarding prevention/treatment services	Area 7: Community services

There are several tasks across the key activity areas which at least one-fourth of respondents indicated they've found to be **difficult** or **extremely difficult**. Those results appear in the table below.

An even great percentage of respondents—at least three-fourths—said they found *linking children to dental homes that serve young children* **difficult** or **extremely difficult** (78.2 percent). Nearly half said they found *coordination with Even Start* **difficult** or **extremely difficult**.

Table 25: Tasks which Head Start agencies said were difficult or extremely difficult.

% of Respondents	Task	Key Activity Area
78.2 %	Linking children to dental homes that serve young children	Area 1: Health care
47.4 %	Coordination with Even Start	Area 5: Family Literacy
35.0 %	Getting involved in state level planning and policy development	Area 3: Welfare/Child welfare
33.4 %	Coordinating transportation with LEAs	Area 8B: Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12
33.4 %	Provision of services to meet needs of working parents, as applicable	Area 8A: Partnerships with Local Education Agencies
30.4 %	In coordination with LEA, developing and implementing family outreach and support efforts under McKinney-Vento and transition planning for children experiencing homelessness	Area 2: Children and families experiencing homelessness
29.4 %	Staff release time to attend professional development activities	Area 9: Professional Development
29.4 %	Accessing early childhood education degree programs in the community	Area 9: Professional Development
26.1 %	Engaging community partners, including the local McKinney-Vento liaison, in conducting staff cross-training and planning activities	Area 2: Children and families experiencing homelessness
25.0 %	Exchanging information on roles & resources with other service providers regarding family/child assistance services	Area 3: Welfare/Child welfare
25.0 %	Facilitating shared training and technical assistance opportunities	Area 3: Welfare/Child welfare

Trends within the Key Activity Areas

Key Activity Area 1: Health Care

- For every provider/organization, the majority of respondents said they had at least a **cooperative** level of involvement.
- The best relationships were with *Women, Infants, Children (WIC)* and with *local agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment*.
- For every provider/organization, at least one respondent said they had **no working relationship**.
- More than one-fourth said they had **no working relationship** with *state agencies providing mental health services and treatment services*, and nearly one-fourth with *dental home providers for treatment and care*.
- Respondents said they found the majority of health care-related tasks **somewhat difficult**, except *linking children to dental homes that serve young children*, which the majority found **difficult** or **extremely difficult**, and *getting children enrolled in MaineCare and getting full representation and active commitment on their Health Advisory Committees*, which a large number found **not at all difficult**.
- Comments overwhelmingly indicate that finding dentists who accept MaineCare is a challenge, and that respondents are struggling to get lead screenings for children from medical providers.

Key Activity Area 2: Children Experiencing Homelessness

- More than half of respondents said they had **no working relationship** with the local McKinney-Vento liaison or the Title I Director.
- For every provider/organization, the majority of respondents said they had **no working relationship** or just a **cooperative** relationship.
- For every task, the majority of respondents said they found it **not at all difficult** or **somewhat difficult**.
- A majority (82.6 percent) said they found *implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children experiencing homelessness are identified and prioritized for enrollment to be* **not at all difficult**.
- Comments indicate additional needs related to children experiencing homelessness, including more resources, better solutions to additional stress factors, and full day care.

Key Activity Area 3: Welfare/Child Welfare

- The strongest relationships seem to be with the *Employment and Training and Labor service agencies*, followed by *TANF and Child Welfare*.
- The weakest seem to be with the *Economic and Community Development councils, services and networks supporting foster and adoptive families* and the *Children's Trust agency*.

- The largest percentages of respondents said they found every task in this Key Activity Area to be **not at all difficult**.
- An even 10 percent of respondents found each task **extremely difficult**.
- Comments indicate that when direct contact with providers/organizations is made, relationships are successful.

Key Activity Area 4: Child Care

- The strongest level of involvement seemed to be with state agencies for child care, with 70 percent of respondents reporting **collaboration**.
- The majority of respondents indicated that they do have relationships with the providers/organizations.
- The majority found tasks related to child care **not at all difficult** or **somewhat difficult**. An even 10 percent found each task **extremely difficult**.
- Comments indicate additional problems, including long waiting lists, scarce funding, inflexible regulations and a lack of adequate resources.

Key Activity Area 5: Family Literacy Services

- Eight of the tasks in this Key Activity Area were among those with which at least one-fourth of respondents indicated their Head Start agencies have **no working relationship**.
- More than half (60 percent) said they had **no working relationship** with *Even Start*.
- Only 25 percent said they had a relationship with *Even Start* of **coordination** or **collaboration**.
- Almost half (47.4 percent) said they found *coordinating with Even Start* to be **difficult** or **extremely difficult**, and 26.3 percent said they found it to be **somewhat difficult**.

Key Activity Area 6: Children with Disabilities

- The majority of respondents said their agencies had relationships with providers/organizations.
- The only provider/organizations with which a majority did not indicate a **coordinating** or **collaborative** relationship were *Non-Head Start councils, committees or work groups that address policy/program issues regarding children with disabilities* (for example, *Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, Maine's Expanding Inclusive Opportunities Initiative*).
- More than one-third (36.9 percent) said they had **no working relationship** or a **cooperative** relationship with *state-funded programs for children with disabilities and their families*.
- The majority of respondents found tasks relating to children with disabilities to be **not at all difficult** or **somewhat difficult**.
- Comments indicate additional issues with turnaround times for referrals and restrictive eligibility criteria.

Key Activity Area 7: Community Services

- The majority of respondents indicated relationships with providers/organizations in this area.
- The weakest relationships seem to be with law enforcement, followed by providers of substance abuse prevention/treatment services, private resources geared toward prevention/intervention and providers of emergency services.
- Respondents found the majority of tasks in this area somewhat difficult.

Key Activity Area 8A: Partnerships with Local Education Agencies

- The majority of respondents (72.2 percent) said they had a collaborative relationship with Local Education Agencies.
- Most respondents found tasks related to this area to be **not at all difficult** or **somewhat difficult**.

Key Activity Area 8B: Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12

- All respondents said they had relationships with LEAs in this area.
- The majority of respondents said they found tasks in this area to be **not at all difficult** or **somewhat difficult**.

Key Activity Area 9: Professional Development

- For each provider/organization, the majority of respondents said they had at least a **cooperative** involvement.
- A majority cited **collaborative** relationships with the Head Start T and TA network.
- No respondents said they found accessing T and TA opportunities in the community to be extremely difficult.

Recommendations

- Work with Head Start agencies to develop a comprehensive strategic plan.
- Support Head Start agencies in their efforts to increase the accessibility of dental homes for children receiving MaineCare (Medicaid).
- Assist Head Start agencies in collaborating with their local mental health agencies.
- Support Head Start Agencies to increase awareness of homelessness definitions and implement services for children and families without homes.
- Support Head Start Agencies to increase collaboration with local McKinney-Vento Liaisons.
- Provide educational and networking opportunities to support Head Start staff understanding of Title I funding streams, and support collaboration efforts.
- Assist Head Start agencies in addressing challenges related to lead screenings.
- Support the expansion of Early Head Start programming.
- Develop strategies to increase clarity of communication from State offices.
- Assist Head Start agencies in strengthening family literacy initiatives.
- Encourage Head Start agency participation in committees and/or work groups that address policy/program issues related to children with disabilities.
- Support Head Start agencies in the development and expansion of public Pre-K collaborations.
- Assist Head Start agencies to advocate for the expansion of higher education programs and distance education options.

Appendix A: Survey Results

1. 12 month time frame included (e.g., 9/1/08-8/31/09):

	Response Count
	29
answered question	29
skipped question	1

2. Agency Information

	Response Percent	Response Count
Agency _____	100.0%	29
Address: _____	100.0%	29
Address 2: _____	37.9%	11
City/Town: _____	100.0%	29
State: _____	100.0%	29
ZIP/Postal Code: _____	100.0%	29
	answered question	29
	skipped question	1

3. Contact information for person responsible for this survey:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Name: _____	100.0%	29
Address: _____	100.0%	29
Address 2: _____	37.9%	11
City/Town: _____	100.0%	29
State: _____	100.0%	29
ZIP/Postal Code: _____	100.0%	29
Email Address: _____	100.0%	29
Phone Number: _____	100.0%	29
	answered question	29
	skipped question	1

4. Additional person(s) completing this survey.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Name: _____	100.0%	1
Title _____	100.0%	11
	answered question	11
	skipped question	19

5. Additional person(s) completing survey

	Response Percent	Response Count
Name: _____	100.0%	5
Title _____	100.0%	5
	answered question	5
	skipped question	25

6. Additional person(s) completing survey

	Response Percent	Response Count
Name: _____	100.0%	4
Title _____	100.0%	4
	answered question	4
	skipped question	26

7. Additional person(s) completing survey

	Response Percent	Response Count
Name: _____	100.0%	4
Title _____	100.0%	4
	answered question	4
	skipped question	26

8. Additional person(s) completing survey

	Response Percent	Response Count
Name: _____	100.0%	2
Title _____	100.0%	2
	answered question	2
	skipped question	28

9. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each. Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Medical home* providers	4.3% (1)	39.1% (9)	30.4% (7)	26.1% (6)	23
B. Dental home* providers for treatment & care	21.7% (5)	17.4% (4)	26.1% (6)	34.8% (8)	23
C. State agency(ies) providing mental health prevention and treatment services	26.1% (6)	30.4% (7)	21.7% (5)	21.7% (5)	23
D. Local agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment	4.3% (1)	34.8% (8)	13.0% (3)	47.8% (11)	23
E. Agencies/programs that conduct mental health screenings	8.7% (2)	34.8% (8)	13.0% (3)	43.5% (10)	23
F. WIC (Women, Infants Children)	8.7% (2)	26.1% (6)	13.0% (3)	52.2% (12)	23
G. Other nutrition services (e.g., cooperative extension programs, university projects on nutrition, etc.)	4.3% (1)	21.7% (5)	39.1% (9)	34.8% (8)	23
H. Children's health education providers (e.g., Child Care R&R, community-based training)	8.7% (2)	30.4% (7)	26.1% (6)	34.8% (8)	23
I. Parent health education providers	8.7% (2)	52.2% (12)	21.7% (5)	17.4% (4)	23
J. Home-visiting providers	8.7% (2)	34.8% (8)	26.1% (6)	30.4% (7)	23
K. Community Health Centers	13.0% (3)	47.8% (11)	26.1% (6) 1	3.0% (3)	23
L. Public health services	4.3% (1)	43.5% (10)	34.8% (8) 1	7.4% (4)	23
M. Programs/services related to children's physical fitness and obesity prevention	8.7% (2)	39.1% (9)	34.8% (8)	17.4% (4)	23
				answered question	23
				skipped question	7

10. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult	Response Count
A. Linking children to medical homes	34.8% (8)	47.8% (11)	8.7% (2)	8.7% (2)	23
B. Partnering with medical professionals on health-related issues (e.g., screening, safety, hygiene, etc.)	34.8% (8)	43.5% (10)	8.7% (2)	13.0% (3)	23
C. Linking children to dental homes that serve young children	17.4% (4)	4.3% (1)	30.4% (7)	47.8% (11)	23
D. Partnering with oral health professionals on oral-health related issues (e.g., hygiene, education, etc.)	30.4% (7)	34.8% (8)	21.7% (5)	13.0% (3)	23
E. Getting children enrolled in MaineCare	60.9% (14)	30.4% (7)	0.0% (0)	8.7% (2)	23
F. Arranging coordinated services for children with special health care needs	17.4% (4)	65.2% (15)	4.3% (1)	13.0% (3)	23
G. Assisting parents to communicate effectively with medical/dental providers	8.7% (2)	60.9% (14)	21.7% (5)	8.7% (2)	23
H. Assisting families to get transportation to appointments	13.0% (3)	52.2% (12)	8.7% (2)	26.1% (6)	23
I. Getting full representation and active commitment on your Health Advisory Committee	43.5% (10)	34.8% (8)	4.3% (1)	17.4% (4)	23
J. Sharing 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.)	13.0% (3)	60.9% (14)	13.0% (3)	13.0% (3)	23
K. Exchanging information on roles and resources with medical, dental and other providers/ organizations regarding health care	34.8% (8)	43.5% (10)	8.7% (2)	13.0% (3)	23
				answered question	23
				skipped question	7

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

	Response Count
	15
answered question	15
skipped question	15

12. 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?

	Response Count
	10
answered question	10
skipped question	20

13. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each. Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Local McKinney-Vento liaison	52.2% (12)	30.4% (7)	8.7% (2)	8.7% (2)	23
B. Local agencies serving families experiencing homelessness	13.0% (3)	39.1% (9)	34.8% (8) 1	3.0% (3)	23
C. Local housing agencies and planning groups (e.g., shelters)	17.4% (4)	39.1% (9)	21.7% (5)	21.7% (5)	23
D. Title I Director, if Title I funds are being used to support early care and education programs for children experiencing homelessness *	56.5% (13)	26.1% (6)	4.3% (1)	13.0% (3)	23
				answered question	23
				skipped question	7

14. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult	Response Count
A. Aligning Head Start program definition of homelessness with McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act	69.6% (16)	21.7% (5)	0.0% (0)	8.7% (2)	23
B. Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children experiencing homelessness are identified and prioritized for enrollment	82.6% (19)	8.7% (2)	0.0% (0)	8.7% (2)	23
C. 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	78.3% (18)	13.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	8.7% (2)	23
D. Obtaining sufficient data on the needs of homeless children to inform the program's annual community assessment	34.8% (8)	43.5% (10)	8.7% (2)	13.0% (3)	23
E. Engaging community partners, including the local McKinney-Vento Liaison, in conducting staff cross training and planning activities	13.0% (3)	52.2% (12)	26.1% (6)	8.7% (2)	23
F. Entering into an MOU with the appropriate local entity responsible for managing publicly funded preschool that includes a plan to coordinate selection priorities for eligible children, including children experiencing homelessness	26.1% (6)	52.2% (12)	13.0% (3)	8.7% (2)	23
G. In coordination with LEA, developing and implementing family outreach and support efforts under McKinney-Vento and transition planning for children experiencing homelessness	13.0% (3)	56.5% (13)	17.4% (4)	13.0% (3)	23
				answered question	23
				skipped question	7

15. Comments:

	Response Count
	6
answered question	6
skipped question	24

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

	Response Count
	5
answered question	5
skipped question	25

17. 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?

	Response Count
	7
answered question	7
skipped question	23

18. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each. Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/ agreements)	Response Count
A. TANF agency	0.0% (0)	50.0% (10)	15.0% (3)	35.0% (7)	20
B. Employment & Training and Laborservices agencies	10.0% (2)	35.0% (7)	20.0% (4)	35.0% (7)	20
C. Economic and Community Development Councils	35.0% (7)	30.0% (6)	20.0% (4)	15.0% (3)	20
D. Child Welfare agency	5.0% (1)	45.0% (9)	10.0% (2)	40.0% (8)	20
E. Children's Trust agency	25.0% (5)	30.0% (6)	10.0% (2)	35.0% (7)	20
F. Services and networks supporting foster and adoptive families	15.0% (3)	50.0% (10)	20.0% (4)	15.0% (3)	20
					answered question
					20
					skipped question
					10

19. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult	Response Count
A. Obtaining information and data for community assessment and planning	55.0% (11)	30.0% (6)	5.0% (1)	10.0% (2)	20
B. Working together to target recruitment to families receiving TANF, Employment and Training, and related support services	60.0% (12)	30.0% (6)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	20
C. Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children in the child welfare system are prioritized for enrollment	80.0% (16)	10.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	20
D. Establishing and implementing local interagency partnerships agreements	45.0% (9)	40.0% (8)	5.0% (1)	10.0% (2)	20
E. Facilitating shared training and technical assistance opportunities	45.0% (9)	30.0% (6)	15.0% (3)	10.0% (2)	20
F. Getting involved in state level planning and policy development	50.0% (10)	15.0% (3)	25.0% (5)	10.0% (2)	20
G. Exchanging information on roles & resources with other service providers regarding family/child assistance services	50.0% (10)	25.0% (5)	15.0% (3)	10.0% (2)	20
				answered question	20
				skipped question	10

20. 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.

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	27

21. 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

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	28

22. Using the definitions on described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each. Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. State agency for Child Care	5.0% (1)	10.0% (2)	5.0% (3)	0.0% (14)	20
B. Child Care Resource & Referral agencies	5.0% (1)	20.0% (4)	25.0% (5)	50.0% (10)	20
C. Local child care programs for fullyear, full- day services	10.0% (2)	25.0% (5)	15.0% (3)	50.0% (10)	20
D. State or regional policy/planning committees that address child care issues	20.0% (4)	15.0% (3)	30.0% (6)	35.0% (7)	20
E. Higher education programs/services/ resources related to child care (e.g., lab schools, student interns, crosstraining)	5.0% (1)	15.0% (3)	40.0% (8)	40.0% (8)	20
				answered question	20
				skipped question	10

23. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult	Response Count
A. Establishing linkages/partnerships with child care providers	65.0% (13)	20.0% (4)	5.0% (1)	10.0% (2)	20
B. Assisting families to access full day, full year services	35.0% (7)	45.0% (9)	10.0% (2)	10.0% (2)	20
C. Aligning policies and practices with other service providers	30.0% (6)	50.0% (10)	10.0% (2)	10.0% (2)	20
D. Sharing data/information on children that are jointly served (assessments, outcomes, etc.)	50.0% (10)	35.0% (7)	5.0% (1)	10.0% (2)	20
E. Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/ organizations regarding child care and community needs assessment	55.0% (11)	35.0% (7)	0.0% (0)	10.0% (2)	20
				answered question	20
				skipped question	10

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

	Response Count
	5
answered question	5
skipped question	25

25. 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?

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	27

26. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each. Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Dept. of Ed Title I, Part A Family Literacy	25.0% (5)	30.0% (6)	20.0% (4)	25.0% (5)	20
B. Employment and Training programs	20.0% (4)	35.0% (7)	15.0% (3)	30.0% (6)	20
C. Adult Education	5.0% (1)	45.0% (9)	25.0% (5)	25.0% (5)	20
D. English Language Learner programs & services	30.0% (6)	40.0% (8)	10.0% (2)	20.0% (4)	20
E. Services to promote parent/child literacy interactions ¹	0.0% (2)	30.0% (6)	30.0% (6)	30.0% (6)	20
F. Parent education programs/services	0.0% (0)	40.0% (8)	15.0% (3)	45.0% (9)	20
G. Public libraries	5.0% (1)	50.0% (10)	30.0% (6)	15.0% (3)	20
H. School libraries	10.0% (2)	45.0% (9)	25.0% (5)	20.0% (4)	20
I. Public/private sources that provide book donations or funding for books	15.0% (3)	35.0% (7)	20.0% (4)	30.0% (6)	20
J. Museums	50.0% (10)	35.0% (7)	0.0% (0)	15.0% (3)	20
K. Reading Readiness programs	25.0% (5)	40.0% (8)	15.0% (3)	20.0% (4)	20
L. Higher education programs/services/ resources related to family literacy (e.g., grant projects, student interns, crosstraining, etc.)	20.0% (4)	20.0% (4)	25.0% (5)	35.0% (7)	20
M. Providers of services for children and families who are English language learners (ELL)	25.0% (5)	35.0% (7)	20.0% (4)	20.0% (4)	20
N. Even Start	60.0% (12)	15.0% (3)	15.0% (3)	10.0% (2)	20
O. Born to Read	30.0% (6)	25.0% (5)	25.0% (5)	20.0% (4)	20
P. Raising Readers	45.0% (9)	20.0% (4)	20.0% (4)	15.0% (3)	20
				answered question	20
				skipped question	10

27. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Recruiting families to Family Literacy Services	21.1% (4)	63.2% (12)	5.3% (1)	10.5% (2)	19
B. Educating others (e.g., parents, the community) about the importance of family literacy	31.6% (6)	57.9% (11)	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2)	19
C. Establishing linkages/partnerships with key literacy providers	47.4% (9)	42.1% (8)	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2)	19
D. Establishing linkages/partnerships with key local level organizations/ programs (other than libraries)	26.3% (5)	63.2% (12)	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2)	19
E. Incorporating family literacy into your program policies and practices	68.4% (13)	21.1% (4)	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2)	19
F. Exchanging information with other providers/organizations regarding roles and resources related to family literacy	57.9% (11)	31.6% (6)	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2) 1	9
G. Coordination with Even Start	26.3% (5)	26.3% (5)	15.8% (3)	31.6% (6) 1	9
			answered question		19
			skipped question		11

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

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	28

29. 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?

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	28

30. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each. Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. State Child Development Services (CDS) for children 3-5 (Lead Agency for Part B/619)	0.0% (0)	26.3% (5)	10.5% (2)	63.2% (12)	19
B. Regional CDS Agencies for children 3-5 years of age	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2)	5.3% (1)	84.2% (16)	19
C. State Education Agency—other programs/services (Section 504, special projects re: children with disabilities, etc.)	10.5% (2)	21.1% (4)	36.8% (7)	31.6% (6) 1	9
D. State CDS for children 0-3 (State Lead Agency for Part C)	10.5% (2)	26.3% (5)	21.1% (4)	42.1% (8)	19
E. Regional CDS Agencies for children 0-3	5.3% (1)	15.8% (3)	21.1% (4)	57.9% (11)	19
F. Federally funded programs for families of children with disabilities (e.g., Maine Parent Federation, Maine Disability Rights Center, GEAR, Maternal and Child Health, , Special Medical Services, etc.)	5.3% (1)	26.3% (5)	31.6% (6)	36.8% (7)	19

30. cont. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each. Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
G. State-funded programs for children with disabilities and their families (e.g., developmental services agencies)	5.3% (1)	31.6% (6)	26.3% (5)	36.8% (7)	19
H. University/community college programs/services related to children with disabilities (e.g., Center for Community Inclusion and Disability Studies)	5.3% (1)	21.1% (4)	36.8% (7)	36.8% (7)	19
I. Non-Head Start councils, committees or work groups that address policy/program issues regarding children with disabilities (e.g., Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, Maine's Expanding Inclusive Opportunities Initiative)	21.1% (4)	26.3% (5)	21.1% (4)	31.6% (6)	19
				answered question	19
				skipped question	11

31. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Obtaining timely evaluations of children	21.1% (4)	57.9% (11)	5.3% (1)	15.8% (3)	19
B. Having staff attend IEP or IFSP meetings	42.1% (8)	42.1% (8)	5.3% (1)	10.5% (2)	19
C. Coordinating services with Part C providers (CDS 0-3)	57.9% (11)	21.1% (4)	5.3% (1)	15.8% (3)	19
D. Coordinating services with Part B/619 providers (CDS 3-5)	52.6% (10)	26.3% (5)	5.3% (1)	15.8% (3)	19
E. Sharing data/information on jointly served children (assessments, outcomes, etc.)	63.2% (12)	26.3% (5)	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2)	19
F. Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/organizations regarding services for children with disabilities and their families	57.9% (11)	31.6% (6)	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2)	19
				answered question	19
				skipped question 1	1

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

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	28

33. 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?

	Response Count
	4
answered question	4
skipped question	26

34. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each. Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Law Enforcement	22.2% (4)	38.9% (7)	33.3% (6)	5.6% (1)	18
B. Providers of substance abuse prevention/treatment services	16.7% (3)	33.3% (6)	33.3% (6)	16.7% (3)	18
C. Providers of child abuse prevention/treatment services	5.6% (1)	22.2% (4)	33.3% (6)	38.9% (7)	18
D. Providers of domestic violence prevention/treatment services	5.6% (1)	33.3% (6)	33.3% (6)	27.8% (5)	18
E. Private resources geared toward prevention/intervention (faith-based, business, foundations, shelters, etc)	6.7% (3)	33.3% (6)	22.2% (4)	27.8% (5)	18
F. Providers of emergency services (e.g., Red Cross, state agency responsible for large-scale emergency plans)	16.7% (3)	33.3% (6)	22.2% (4)	27.8% (5)	18
				answered question	18
				skipped question	12

35. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Establishing linkages/partnerships with law enforcement agencies	27.8% (5)	66.7% (12)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18
B. Establishing linkages/partnerships with public resources (state, county, city, etc.) regarding prevention/treatment services	44.4% (8)	44.4% (8)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18

35. cont. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
C. Establishing linkages/partnerships with private resources (e.g., faith-based, foundations, business) regarding prevention/treatment services	33.3% (6)	50.0% (9)	11.1% (2)	5.6% (1)	18
D. Partnering with service providers on outreach activities for eligible families	44.4% (8)	50.0% (9)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18
E. Obtaining in-kind community services for the children/families in your program	44.4% (8)	44.4% (8)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
F. Sharing data/information on children/families served jointly by Head Start and other agencies re: prevention/treatment services	38.9% (7)	55.6% (10)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18
G. Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/ organizations regarding community services	44.4% (8)	50.0% (9)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18
				answered question	18
				skipped question	12

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

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	29

37. 4.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?

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	28

38. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. 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), and a review of each of the activities.	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	16.7% (3)	72.2% (13)	18
			answered question		18
			skipped question		12

39. Head Start programs are required to have an MOU with publicly-funded Pre-K programs in their service areas. The MOU must include a review of, and plans to coordinate, as appropriate, 10 areas/activities, as listed below. For each of the following items, please rate the level of difficulty you have had in the past, or may have as you coordinate these activities with publicly funded Pre-K programs. Select one rating for each item.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Educational activities, curricular objectives and instruction	27.8% (5)	61.1% (11)	0.0% (0)	11.1% (2)	18
B. Information, dissemination and access for families contacting Head Start or other preschool program	44.4% (8)	44.4% (8)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
C. Selection priorities for eligible children served	55.6% (10)	38.9% (7)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18
D. Service areas	44.4% (8)	38.9% (7)	11.1% (2)	5.6% (1)	18
E. Staff training, including opportunities for joint staff training	50.0% (9)	44.4% (8)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18
F. Program technical assistance	44.4% (8)	50.0% (9)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18

39. cont. Head Start programs are required to have an MOU with publicly-funded Pre-K programs in their service areas. The MOU must include a review of, and plans to coordinate, as appropriate, 10 areas/activities, as listed below. For each of the following items, please rate the level of difficulty you have had in the past, or may have as you coordinate these activities with publiclyfunded Pre-K programs. Select one rating for each item.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
G. Provision of services to meet needs of working parents, as applicable	33.3% (6)	33.3% (6)	27.8% (5)	5.6% (1)	18
H. Communications and parent outreach for transition to kindergarten	66.7% (12)	22.2% (4)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
I. Provision and use of facilities, transportation, etc.	44.4% (8)	33.3% (6)	1.1% (2)	11.1% (2)	18
J. Other elements mutually agreed to by the parties to the MOU	38.9% (7)	55.6% (10)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18
				answered question	18
				skipped question	12

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

	Response Count
	7
answered question	7
skipped question	23

41. What is working well in your efforts to develop partnerships with Local Education Agencies managing pre-k programs in your service areas? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

	Response Count
	5
answered question	5
skipped question	25

42. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with local education agencies (LEAs) during the past 12 months. Check one rating. Note: If you have different relationships with different LEAs, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them.

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Relationship with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) regarding transition from Head Start to kindergarten	0.0% (0)	27.8% (5)	22.2% (4)	50.0% (9)	18
				answered question	18
				skipped question	12

43. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult	Response Count
A. Coordinating with LEAs to implement systematic procedures for transferring Head Start program records to school	44.4% (8)	44.4% (8)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
B. Ongoing communication with LEAs to facilitate coordination of programs (including teachers, social workers, McKinney Vento liaisons, etc.)	27.8% (5)	61.1% (11)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
C. Establishing and implementing comprehensive transition policies and procedures with LEAs ¹	6.7% (3)	72.2% (13)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
D. Linking LEA and Head Start services relating to language, numeracy and literacy	38.9% (7)	50.0% (9)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
E. Aligning LEA and Head Start curricula and assessments with Head Start Child Outcomes Framework	50.0% (9)	33.3% (6)	5.6% (1)	1.1% (2)	18
F. Aligning Head Start curricula with state Early Learning Standards	77.8% (14)	16.7% (3)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18

43. cont. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult	Response Count
G. Partnering with LEAs and parents to assist individual children/families to transition to school, including review of portfolio/records	38.9% (7)	38.9% (7)	16.7% (3)	5.6% (1)	18
H. Coordinating transportation with LEAs	33.3% (6)	33.3% (6)	16.7% (3)	16.7% (3) 1	8
I. Coordinating shared use of facilities with LEAs	16.7% (3)	72.2% (13)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
J. Coordinating with LEAs regarding other support services for children and families	27.8% (5)	61.1% (11)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
K. Conducting joint outreach to parents and LEA to discuss needs of children entering kindergarten	22.2% (4)	66.7% (12)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
L. Establish policies and procedures that support children transition to school that includes engagement with LEA	33.3% (6)	55.6% (10)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
M. Helping parents of limited English proficient children understand instructional and other information and services provided by the receiving school.	38.9% (7)	55.6% (10)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1) 1	8
N. Exchanging information with LEAs on roles, resources and regulations	44.4% (8)	50.0% (9)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18
O. Aligning curricula and assessment practices with LEAs	44.4% (8)	50.0% (9)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	18
P. Organizing and participating in joint training, including transition related training for school staff and Head Start staff	16.7% (3)	72.2% (13)	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	18
	27.8% (5)	55.6% (10)	11.1% (2)	5.6% (1)	18
				answered question	18
				skipped question	12

44. 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?

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	27

45. 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?

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	27

46. Using the definitions described earlier, please rate the extent of your involvement with each of the following service providers/organizations during the past 12 months. Check one rating for each. Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that best describes your relationship with most of them

	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)	Response Count
A. Institutions of Higher Education (4 year)	11.8% (2)	35.3% (6)	47.1% (8)	5.9% (1)	17
B. Institutions of Higher Education (less than 4 year)(e.g., community colleges)	0.0% (0)	41.2% (7)	29.4% (5)	29.4% (5)	17
C. On-line courses/programs	23.5% (4)	47.1% (8)	23.5% (4)	5.9% (1)	17
D. Child Care Resource & Referral Network	5.9% (1)	11.8% (2)	35.3% (6)	47.1% (8)	17
E. Head Start T & TA Network	0.0% (0)	11.8% (2)	17.6% (3)	70.6% (12)	17
F. Other T & TA networks (regional, state)	17.6% (3)	17.6% (3)	47.1% (8)	17.6% (3)	17
G. Service providers/organizations offering relevant training/TA crosstraining opportunities	0.0% (0)	41.2% (7)	47.1% (8)	11.8% (2)	17
					answered question 17
					skipped question 13

47. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following was difficult during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult	Response Count
A. Transferring credits between public institutions of learning	17.6% (3)	58.8% (10)	17.6% (3)	5.9% (1)	17
B. Accessing early childhood education degree programs in the community	29.4% (5)	41.2% (7)	17.6% (3)	11.8% (2)	17
C. Accessing T & TA opportunities in the community (including crosstraining)	52.9% (9)	29.4% (5)	17.6% (3)	0.0% (0)	17
D. Accessing scholarships and other financial support for professional development programs/activities	17.6% (3)	70.6% (12)	5.9% (1)	5.9% (1)	17
E. Staff release time to attend professional development activities	23.5% (4)	47.1% (8)	23.5% (4)	5.9% (1)	17
				answered question	17
				skipped question	13

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

	Response Count
	5
answered question	5
skipped question	25

49. 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?

	Response Count
	4
answered question	4
skipped question	26

Appendix B: Survey Instrument



HEAD START STATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

A. Date survey was completed: _____	12-month time frame included (e.g., 9/1/08 – 8/31/09): _____
--	---

B. Name and title of person(s) completing this survey:

Name	Title
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

C. Head Start Agency Information:

Name:		Phone:
Address:		

D. Contact information for person responsible for this survey:

Name:		Title:
Address:		
Phone:		Email:

Please complete this survey by _____(DATE) and submit it (e.g., electronically, via mail in postage-paid envelope, etc.) to (CONTACT INFO).

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact:

(CONTACT INFORMATION)

Head Start State Needs Assessment Survey 6/2008

Introduction for Head Start Agencies

The Head Start Act (as amended December 12, 2007) requires the Head Start State Collaboration Offices (HSSCOs) to conduct a needs assessment of Head Start grantees in the State (including Early Head Start grantees) in the areas of coordination, collaboration alignment of services, and alignment of curricula and assessments used in Head Start programs with the Head Start Child Outcomes Framework and, as appropriate, State Early Learning Standards

The Head Start Act also requires the HSSCOs to use the results of the needs assessment to develop a strategic plan outlining how they will assist and support Head Start grantees in meeting the requirements of the Head Start Act for coordination, collaboration, transition to elementary school and alignment with K-12 education. HSSCOs must also annually update the needs assessment and strategic plan and make the results of the needs assessment available to the general public within the State.

The purpose of gathering this information is to identify your needs in the specified areas and inform the activities of the annually revised strategic plan for the Head Start State Collaboration Office in your state.

This needs assessment survey questionnaire is organized around the eight national priority areas for the HSSCOs. These priority areas are: 1) Health Services; 2) Services for Children Experiencing Homelessness; 3) Welfare//Child Welfare 4) Child Care; 5) Family Literacy; 6) Services for Children with Disabilities; 7) Community Services; and 8) Education. In addition, sections are included to cover the areas of Head Start- Pre-K Partnership Development, Head Start transition and Alignment with K-12 and Professional Development.

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

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

No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)
---	---	--	--

Definitions:

No working relationship. You have **little or no contact with each other** (i.e.; **you do not:** make /receive referrals, work together on projects/activities, share information, etc.)

Cooperation. You **exchange information.** This includes making and receiving referrals, even when you serve the same families.

Coordination. You **work together on project 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. You **share resources and/or have formal, written agreements.** Examples: cofunded staff or building costs; joint funding for a new initiative; an MOU on transition, etc.

Part 2 asks you to indicate the level of difficulty your 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 you in identifying challenges you may be experiencing in building successful partnerships at the local and state levels to support the delivery of quality education and comprehensive services to your 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 you the opportunity to document any remaining concerns that were not covered in the survey. The second question gives you the opportunity to document what is working well in your program, and to indicate if any of these successful strategies/activities may be helpful to other programs.

Your Head Start State Collaboration Director will aggregate the survey findings from all Head Start agencies in your state and then compile a report that will be forwarded to the Office of Head Start, regional office, made available to you and to the general public.

Thank you for taking the time to reflect on the co-ordination and collaboration challenges and accomplishments in your program(s). The cumulative findings from this needs assessment survey will assist your collaboration director to support your program needs in the collaboration and systems development work in your state. Our shared goal is to support and promote your success in serving our children and families.

1. HEALTH CARE

1. Using the definitions on page 2, please rate the **extent of your involvement** with each of the following service providers/organizations **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating** for each.

*Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that **best describes** your relationship with **most** of them.*

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/ agreements)
A. Medical home* providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Dental home* providers for treatment & care	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. State agency(ies) providing mental health prevention and treatment service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Local agencies providing mental health prevention and treatment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Agencies/programs that conduct mental health screenings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. WIC (Women, Infants Children)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Other nutrition services (e.g., cooperative extension programs, university projects on nutrition, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Children's health education providers (e.g., Child Care R&R, community-based training)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I. Parent health education providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
J. Home-visiting providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
K. Community Health Centers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
L. Public health services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
M. Programs/services related to children's physical fitness and obesity prevention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note: "Medical and Dental Home" means comprehensive, coordinated care and not just access to a doctor or dentist, particularly for one-time exams.

2. Please indicate the **extent to which each of the following was difficult** during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Linking children to medical homes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Partnering with medical professionals on health-related issues (e.g., screening, safety, hygiene, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Linking children to dental homes that serve young children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Partnering with oral health professionals on oral-health related issues (e.g., hygiene, education, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Getting children enrolled in CHIP or Medicaid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Arranging coordinated services for children with special health care needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Assisting parents to communicate effectively with medical/dental providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Assisting families to get transportation to appointments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I. Getting full representation and active commitment on your Health Advisory Committee	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
J. Sharing 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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
K. Exchanging information on roles and resources with medical, dental and other providers/ organizations regarding health care	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

4. 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?

2. SERVICES FOR CHILDREN EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS

Using the definitions on page 2, please rate the **extent of your involvement** with each of the following service providers/organizations **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating** for each.

*Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that **best describes** your relationship with **most** of them.*

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)
A. Local McKinney-Vento liaison	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Local agencies serving families experiencing homelessness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Local housing agencies and planning groups (e.g., shelters, Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness committees)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Title I Director, if Title I funds are being used to support early care and education programs for children experiencing homelessness *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please indicate the **extent to which each of the following was difficult** during the past 12 months. Select **one rating** for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Aligning Head Start program definition of homelessness with McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children experiencing homelessness are identified and prioritized for enrollment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Note: Title I funded preschool programs must follow the Head Start Performance Standards*

	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
D. Obtaining sufficient data on the needs of homeless children to inform the program's annual community assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Engaging community partners, including the local McKinney-Vento Liaison, in conducting staff cross training and planning activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Entering into an MOU with the appropriate local entity responsible for managing publicly funded preschool that includes a plan to coordinate selection priorities for eligible children, including children experiencing homelessness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. In coordination with LEA, developing and implementing family outreach and support efforts under McKinney-Vento and transition planning for children experiencing homelessness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

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

4. 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?

3. WELFARE/CHILD WELFARE

1. Using the definitions on page 2, please rate the **extent of your involvement** with each of the following service providers/organizations **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating** for each.

Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that **best describes** your relationship with **most** of them.

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/ agreements)
A. TANF agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Employment & Training and Labor services agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Economic and Community Development Councils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Child Welfare agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Children's Trust agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Services and networks supporting foster and adoptive families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please indicate the **extent to which each of the following was difficult** during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Obtaining information and data for community assessment and planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Working together to target recruitment to families receiving TANF, Employment and Training, and related support services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Implementing policies and procedures to ensure that children in the child welfare system are prioritized for enrollment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Establishing and implementing local interagency partnerships agreements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Facilitating shared training and technical assistance opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Getting involved in state level planning and policy development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Exchanging information on roles & resources with other service providers regarding family/child assistance services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. 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.

4. 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?

4. CHILD CARE

1. Using the definitions on page 2, please rate the **extent of your involvement** with each of the following service providers/ organizations **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating** for each.

*Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that **best describes** your relationship with **most** of them.*

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/ agreements)
A. State agency for Child Care	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Child Care Resource & Referral agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Local child care programs for full-year, full- day services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. State or regional policy/planning committees that address child care issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Higher education programs/services/ resources related to child care (e.g., lab schools, student interns, cross-training)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please indicate the **extent to which each of the following was difficult** during the past 12 months. Select **one rating** for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Establishing linkages/partnerships with child care providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Assisting families to access full-day, full year services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Aligning policies and practices with other service providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Sharing data/information on children that are jointly served (assessments, outcomes, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/ organizations regarding child care and community needs assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

4. 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?

5. FAMILY LITERACY SERVICES

1. Using the definitions on page 2, please rate the **extent of your involvement** with each of the following service providers/organizations **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating** for each.

*Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that **best describes** your relationship with **most** of them.*

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)
A. Dept. of Ed Title I, Part A Family Literacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Employment and Training programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Adult Education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. English Language Learner programs & services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Services to promote parent/child literacy interactions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Parent education programs/services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Public libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. School libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I. Public/private sources that provide book donations or funding for books	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
J. Museums	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
K. Reading Readiness programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
L. Higher education programs/services/ resources related to family literacy (e.g., grant projects, student interns, cross-training, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
M. Providers of services for children and families who are English language learners (ELL)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
N. Even Start	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please indicate the **extent to which each of the following was difficult** during the past 12 months. Select **one rating** for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Recruiting families to Family Literacy Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Educating others (e.g., parents, the community) about the importance of family literacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Establishing linkages/partnerships with key literacy providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Establishing linkages/partnerships with key local level organizations/programs (other than libraries)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Incorporating family literacy into your program policies and practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Exchanging information with other providers/organizations regarding roles and resources related to family literacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

4. 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?

6. SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

1. Using the definitions on page 2, please rate the **extent of your involvement** with each of the following service providers/organizations **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating** for each.

*Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that **best describes** your relationship with **most** of them.*

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/ agreements)
A. State Lead Agency for Part B/619	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Local Part B/619 providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. State Education Agency—other programs/services (Section 504, special projects re: children with disabilities, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. State Lead Agency for Part C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Local Part C providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. 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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. State-funded programs for children with disabilities and their families (e.g., developmental services agencies)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. University/community college programs/ services related to children with disabilities (e.g., University Centers for Excellence on Disability/others)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I. 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please indicate the **extent to which each of the following was difficult** during the past 12 months. Select one rating for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Obtaining timely evaluations of children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Having staff attend IEP or IFSP meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Coordinating services with Part C providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Coordinating services with Part B/619 providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Sharing data/information on jointly served children (assessments, outcomes, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/ organizations regarding services for children with disabilities and their families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

4. 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?

7. COMMUNITY SERVICES

1. Using the definitions on page 2, please rate the **extent of your involvement** with each of the following service providers/organizations **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating** for each.

*Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that **best describes** your relationship with **most** of them.*

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)
A. Law Enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Providers of substance abuse prevention/treatment services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Providers of child abuse prevention/treatment services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Providers of domestic violence prevention/treatment services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Private resources geared toward prevention/intervention (faith-based, business, foundations, shelters, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Providers of emergency services (e.g., Red Cross, state agency responsible for large-scale emergency plans)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please indicate the **extent to which each of the following was difficult** during the past 12 months. Select **one rating** for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Establishing linkages/partnerships with law enforcement agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Establishing linkages/partnerships with public resources (state, county, city, etc.) regarding prevention/treatment services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Establishing linkages/partnerships with private resources (e.g., faith-based, foundations, business) regarding prevention/treatment services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Partnering with service providers on outreach activities for eligible families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Obtaining in-kind community services for the children/families in your program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Area cont.	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
F. Sharing data/information on children/families served jointly by Head Start and other agencies re: prevention/treatment services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/ organizations regarding community services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

4. 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?

8A. PARTNERSHIPS WITH LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

1. Using the definitions on page 2, please rate the **extent of your involvement** with each of the following service providers/organizations **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating** for each.

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)
A. 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), and a review of each of the activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. No publicly funded pre-k in this state Check "no working relationship"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Head Start programs are required to have an MOU with publicly-funded Pre-K programs in their service areas. The MOU must include a review of, and plans to coordinate, as appropriate, 10 areas/activities, as listed below. For each of the following items, please rate the level of difficulty you have had in the past, or may have as you coordinate these activities with publicly-funded Pre-K programs. Select one rating for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Educational activities, curricular objectives and instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Information, dissemination and access for families contacting Head Start or other preschool program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Selection priorities for eligible children served	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Service areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Staff training, including opportunities for joint staff training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Program technical assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Provision of services to meet needs of working parents, as applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Communications and parent outreach for transition to kindergarten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Area cont.	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
I. Provision and use of facilities, transportation, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
J. Other elements mutually agreed to by the parties to the MOU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

4. What is working well in your efforts to develop partnerships with Local Education Agencies managing pre-k programs in your service areas? Which of these efforts do you think may be helpful to other programs?

8B. Head Start Transition and Alignment with K-12

1. Using the definitions on page 2, please rate the **extent of your involvement** with local education agencies (LEAs) **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating**.

Note: If you have different relationships with different LEAs, check the option that **best describes** your relationship with **most** of them.

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)
A. Relationship with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) regarding transition from Head Start to kindergarten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please indicate the **extent to which each of the following was difficult** during the past 12 months. Select **one rating** for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Coordinating with LEAs to implement systematic procedures for transferring Head Start program records to school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Ongoing communication with LEAs to facilitate coordination of programs (including teachers, social workers, McKinney Vento liaisons, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Establishing and implementing comprehensive transition policies and procedures with LEAs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Linking LEA and Head Start services relating to language, numeracy and literacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Aligning LEA and Head Start curricula and assessments with Head Start Child Outcomes Framework	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Aligning Head Start curricula with state Early Learning Standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Partnering with LEAs and parents to assist individual children/families to transition to school, including review of portfolio/records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Coordinating transportation with LEAs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I. Coordinating shared use of facilities with LEAs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Area (continued)	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
J. Coordinating with LEAs regarding other support services for children and families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
K. Conducting joint outreach to parents and LEA to discuss needs of children entering kindergarten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
L. Establish policies and procedures that support children transition to school that includes engagement with LEA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
M. Helping parents of limited English proficient children understand instructional and other information and services provided by the receiving school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
N. Exchanging information with LEAs on roles, resources and regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
O. Aligning curricula and assessment practices with LEAs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P. Organizing and participating in joint training, including transition-related training for school staff and Head Start staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. 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?

4. 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?

9. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1. Using the definitions on page 2, please **rate the extent of your involvement** with each of the following service providers/organizations **during the past 12 months**. Check **one rating** for each.

Note: If you have different relationships with different providers/organizations in a category, check the option that **best describes** your relationship with **most** of them.

Category	No Working Relationship (little/no contact)	Cooperation (exchange info/referrals)	Coordination (work together)	Collaboration (share resources/agreements)
A. Institutions of Higher Education (4 year)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Institutions of Higher Education (less than 4 year)(e.g., community colleges)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. On-line courses/programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Child Care Resource & Referral Network	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Head Start T & TA Network	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Other T & TA networks (regional, state)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Service providers/organizations offering relevant training/TA cross-training opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please indicate the **extent to which each of the following was difficult** during the past 12 months. Select **one rating** for each item.

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
A. Transferring credits between public institutions of learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Accessing early childhood education degree programs in the community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Accessing T & TA opportunities in the community (including cross-training)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Accessing scholarships and other financial support for professional development programs/activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Staff release time to attend professional development activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Accessing on-line professional development opportunities (e.g., availability of equipment, internet connection, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Area	Not at All Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Extremely Difficult
G. Exchanging information on roles and resources with other providers/ organizations regarding professional development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

4. 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?

The Maine Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) does not discriminate on the basis of disability, race, color, creed, gender, sexual orientation, age, or national origin, in admission to, access to, or operations of its programs, services, or activities, or its hiring or employment practices. This notice is provided as required by Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and in accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and the Maine Human Rights Act and Executive Order Regarding State of Maine Contracts for Services. Please direct complaints, requests for accommodations, interpreters, or questions regarding this notice to DHHS Civil Rights, 11 SHS-221 State Street, Augusta, Maine 04333, or call 207-624-7900 (V), 1-800-606-0215 (TTY). This notice is available in alternate formats, upon request.

Maine Head Start



EARLY CARE & EDUCATION
Early Childhood Division



Department of Health
and Human Services

*Maine People Living
Safe, Healthy and Productive Lives*

John E. Baldacci, Governor

Brenda M. Harvey, Commissioner

11 State House Station • Augusta, ME 04333
Telephone: 207-624-7909 • TTY: 1-800-606-0215
FAX: 207-287-6156
www.maine.gov/dhhs/occhs/

CARING... RESPONSIVE... WELL-MANAGED. WE ARE DHHS.