Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge
2014 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

California

JUNE **2015**

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Table of Contents

APR Cover Sheet **1**

Certification **2**

Executive Summary **3**

Successful State Systems **14**
- Governance Structure 14
- Stakeholder Involvement 20
- Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders 22
- Participating State Agencies 23

High-Quality, Accountable Programs **24**
- Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application) 24
- Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application) 28
- Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) 31
- Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application) 35
- Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application) 39
- Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) 42
- Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) 43
- Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application) 46
- Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E) 47

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes **48**
- Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application) 48
- Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application) 50
- Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) 52

Early Childhood Education Workforce **54**
- Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application) 54
- Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application) 55
- Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) 58
- Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) 59

Measuring Outcomes and Progress **61**
- Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application) 61

Data Tables **64**
- Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age 64
- Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs 65
- Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age 67

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity 68
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development 70
Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State 72
Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards 73
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State 74

Budget and Expenditure Tables 75
Budget Summary Table 75
Budget Table: Project 1 – Grants Management 77
Budget Table: Project 2 – Regional Leadership Consortia, Expansion and Related Activities 79
Budget Table: Project 3 – Home Visiting 81
Budget Table: Project 4 – Screening Tool Distribution 83
Budget Table: Project 5 – Curricula Development for Higher Education 85
Budget Table: Project 6 – CSEFEL 87
Budget Table: Project 7 – Licensing Website 89
Budget Table: Project 8 – Linking KEA Data to CALPADS 91
Budget Table: Project 9 – PAS/BAS Training For Mentors 93
Budget Table: Project 10 – Electronic Training Materials On Existing Content 95
Budget Table: Project 11 – Professional Development For Early Start 97
Budget Table: Project 12 – Evaluation 99
Budget Table: Project 13 – Inter-Rater Reliability 101

Note: *All information in this document was prepared and submitted by the* ***Grantee*** *as their annual performance report (APR). For reference, the instructions and prompts from the approved APR form are included in italics throughout the document. Check marks in tables indicate the Grantee selected the option. A blank cells in a table indicates that the Grantee did not provide data or did not select the option.*

APR Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award #: S412A120003

2. Grantee Name: Office of the Governor, State of California

3. Grantee Address: State Capitol, Suite 1173, Sacramento, California 95814

4. Project Director Name: Debra McMannis

Title: Director

Phone #: ((916) 324-0730 **Fax #:** (916) 323-6853

Email Address: dmcmannis@cde.ca.gov

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: 1/1/2014 **to** 12/31/2014

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? ☑ Yes ☐ No

b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? ☑ Yes ☐ No

c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): 07/01/2013 to 06/30/2014

Approving Federal agency: ☑ ED ☐ HHS ☐ Other (Please specify):

Certification

The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:

The Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program (see section 511 of Title V of the Social Security Act, as added by section 2951 of the Affordable Care Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-148))

☑ Yes ☐ No

Programs authorized under section 619 of part B and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

☑ Yes ☐ No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

☑ Yes ☐ No

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Signed by Authorized Representative

Name: Debra McMannis

Title: Director

Executive Summary

For the reporting year, please provide a summary of your State's (1) accomplishments, (2) lessons learned, (3) challenges, and (4) strategies you will implement to address those challenges.

California's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) implements a unique approach that builds upon its local and statewide successes to create sustainable capacity at the local level and addresses the geographic and cultural diversity of California. This approach best meets the needs of our early learners, with a focus on those with the highest needs. To achieve its ambitious goal, California is using the majority of the funding to support the development and expansion of successful local quality improvement efforts that are focused on improved outcomes for children with high needs by implementing local Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS). Approximately 77 percent of the grant funding is being spent at the local level to support a voluntary network of 17 Regional Leadership Consortia (Consortia) in 16 counties. Each consortium is led by an established organization that is already operating or was developing a QRIS or quality improvement system and allocating local resources to the efforts. In 2014, consortia expanded services by bringing on 14 mentee counties to build a QRIS; mentoring activities included funding, training assessors, developing coaches, assisting with data practices, and supporting a continuous quality improvement approach. More than 2 million (95 percent) of children under five in California are represented by the 30 consortia and mentee counties.

In addition, California is using a portion of the RTT-ELC grant funds to make several one-time investments in state capacity via 11 projects. These investments range from supporting California Departments of Developmental Services and Public Health's work on developmental screening to developing online training modules of core content and resources. A Request for Proposal was successful in identifying a contractor to conduct the required evaluation to validate the effectiveness of the Consortia QRISs and the three common tiers they have agreed to implement. Many of these additional projects are targeted at supporting the Consortia but also provide additional resources for the state as a whole. The California Department of Education (CDE) is the RTT-ELC lead agency which is responsible for overall grant administration and project monitoring. Staff members from the CDE Early Education and Support Division (EESD) (formerly called the Child Development Division) and First 5 California (F5CA) serve as the RTT-ELC Implementation Team that provides Consortia and workgroup meeting planning and facilitation, technical assistance (TA) and support, and fiscal and programmatic oversight.

During the third year of the grant, California moved forward in multiple areas while also encountering some challenges and several lessons learned across the following five federal RTT-ELC reform areas:

1. Successful State Systems
2. High-Quality, Accountable Programs (QRIS)
3. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children
4. A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce
5. Measuring Outcomes and Progress

Accomplishments

The following are highlights of accomplishments achieved in key areas:

Governance Structures and Leadership

Both locally and at the state, progress continued on the Governance Structures. Representatives from the Governor's Administration [Department of Finance (DOF), Department of Social Services (CDSS), and State Board of Education (SBE)] were included in all Consortia Meetings and kept abreast of major developments. All

Consortia members continued to demonstrate strong commitment and collaboration during the third year of RTT-ELC by sharing sample documents, providing feedback, and actively participating in RTT-ELC work groups [Evaluation, Continuous Quality Improvement Pathways (Pathways), and Rating and Monitoring] convened by the Implementation Team in 2014. Managed by the Implementation Team, the dropbox.com account continued to serve as a hub for common documents for reporting, up-to-date implementation guidance, and historical meeting agendas and minutes, as well as Consortia-specific documents that are available for shared use.

Quality Continuum Framework (Framework)/Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS)

The Consortia, along with the Implementation Team, continued its significant progress in refining and operationalizing California's Quality Continuum Framework, including the Hybrid Matrix and Pathways Core Tools & Resources, through collective commitments from multiple stakeholders, aligning and leveraging quality improvement initiatives, and focusing coaching and continuous quality improvement practices to support the rated elements and Pathways. Supported through RTT-ELC one-time investments, CDE, and F5CA projects, consortia focused training and technical assistance efforts on topics in the Quality Continuum Framework.

Stakeholder Engagement and Building of Local Consortia

The Consortia is proud of the strong participation in their community stakeholder meetings, focus groups, surveys, and planning team efforts, all of which allowed them to garner input on program elements and potential opportunities and impacts for their communities. They convened extensive and inclusive community consortium meetings and brought together all the stakeholders who operate existing quality enhancement programs, providers and parents who use those programs, and other community agencies. Ongoing feedback continued to be a priority in 2014 as the Consortia sought input regarding implementation efforts, the Implementation Guide, the Pathways, and decisions brought back from the full Consortia meetings. The Consortia expressed that the ongoing full Consortia meetings and regional and/or local level meetings were extremely valuable. They provided added clarity from the state and federal governments as well as an opportunity for consensus decisions by the Consortia, and, more importantly, to share these communications with their local stakeholders.

Consortia more fully established their advisory committees, made progress on communication and marketing, implemented data systems, and designed Web sites. In addition, the Consortia strengthened their partnerships and communication with Local Child Care and Development Planning Councils (LPCs), school districts, and other CDE-funded quality improvement projects. Consortia gave presentations at Family Child Care Network, school districts, community colleges, and other community agencies to build awareness and provide updates about RTT-ELC and QRIS and strengthen their outreach efforts and support the work of the advisory committee. Several consortia implemented more formal advisory structures with subcommittees to work on strategic planning, quality improvement and recognition, efficient data systems, alignment, and other systems functions to ensure sustainability of RTT-ELC efforts. One consortium wrote,

> *We have fostered an effective partnership with County Office of Education, Child Care Council (R&R), and the three Community Colleges which has allowed for effective engagement of new sites, and ensured continued participation of existing programs.*
>
> - First 5 Contra Costa County.

Five consortia in the Bay Area (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz) developed a regional approach to RTT-ELC, which entails sharing a robust quality rating database system, a regional

assessment protocol, a joint framework for a coaching model, and a common framework for the development of a common tool for quality improvement plan.

Leveraging and Aligning with Other Efforts

One of the most exciting successes to date expressed by the Consortia is the unprecedented opportunity RTT-ELC provides to refocus existing public and private investments on evidence-based and promising practices. In essence, RTT-ELC created an umbrella for other quality improvement and funding efforts.

Prior to becoming a Consortia member, several consortia noted their program quality efforts were well established but functioning as separate projects. With the TQRIS Framework and the RTT-ELC goals and objectives, these independent projects have been aligned with the overarching program quality improvement system and are building upon each other. The key quality improvement tools, such as the Environment Rating Scales (ERS) and the Classroom Assessment Scoring System™ (CLASS), are integral to the adopted Matrix and serve as a common foundation to align the work of other existing quality improvement efforts. Consortia view the RTT-ELC as a pilot, which provides opportunities to develop innovative service delivery models and develop focused partnerships that can later be taken to scale. One consortium wrote,

> *We implemented a library partnership which built upon existing strong library- provider relationships resulting in successful engagement of 25 new Tier 1 and 2 providers*
>
> - First 5 El Dorado County.

Locally, the Consortia have begun to fully integrate multiple funding streams from the federal, state, and local level into a comprehensive local quality improvement system - their TQRIS. Most of the consortia noted in their Annual Performance Reports (APR) that they are using the local TQRIS as a framework for all their other quality efforts and using the definition of quality developed for RTT-ELC implementation. Some consortia explicitly expressed that participation in RTT-ELC has become a catalyst in leveraging existing programs, such as the F5CA's Child Signature Program (CSP), and Comprehensive Approaches to Raising Educational Standards (CARES) Plus Program, and grant funding. One consortium wrote,

> *We have made a conscious effort to fully integrate QRIS, accreditation, the CARES Plus Program, and First 5 tuition scholarships. We are conducting special meetings to focus on planning and tracking our progress with the end result being seamless, one stop shop for quality improvement support in our county and a framework in which to easily and quickly integrate new projects and funding.*
>
> - First 5 Santa Barbara County

As a result of the implementation of RTT-ELC, existing additional quality enhancement projects are being updated so that their requirements align with the requirements of RTT-ELC to create consistency across local publicly funded projects. Consortia have aligned these projects to ensure participants are prepared to be rated via the local TQRIS, support quality improvement in the participating early learning and development programs, and expand access to screenings and health care services.

QRIS Implementation

Every consortia reported making significant progress in fully implementing their TQRIS and rating sites. Consortia advanced their work in developing local TQRIS databases by engaging sites and conducting orientation sessions, completing program and classroom baseline assessments based on the TQRIS, broadening training and

technical assistance (T&TA), fully integrating local quality improvement and workforce development funding streams, and strengthening relationships with institutes of higher education to offer expanded course offerings.

Every consortium reported moving forward with their local RTT-ELC Action Plans and most exceed their targets in recruiting and rating sites in 2014. They are engaging programs that represent an excellent cross section of the early learning community and prioritizing those serving children with high needs. In 2014, consortia also hired and trained coaches and project staff or contracted with other entities to carry out the training, observation, evaluation, or coaching activities.

Several consortia administrators attended the National QRIS meeting in Denver, in July 2014 which contributed to their implementation of the QRIS in 2014. This networking opportunity gave consortia an opportunity to address challenges faced in 2013. One consortium said,

> *The conference offered many opportunities to network with others from across the country and explore a variety of options for communicating ratings. This information was brought to our local stakeholders for discussion and input. After a series of meetings, the local TQRIS Hybrid Rating framework was modified to correlate with a commonly recognized award system of Bronze, Silver and Gold. The tiers were assigned quality level labels to better communicate ratings.*
>
> - Merced County Office of Education

Rating and Monitoring

Consortia members worked to build their cadre of trained and reliable assessors in the Environment Rating Scales (ERS) and Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) tools. Nearly every consortia reported success in rating sites, exceeding targets for 2014. The Implementation Guide decisions helping the Consortia to clarify site selection, rating criteria, and information was used to successfully engage sites and carry out an initial rating.

In 2014, F5CA received a RTT-ELC contract to work with consortia to develop assessor management practices and build a cadre of trained and reliable ERS anchors, ERS assessors, and CLASS® assessors. Consortia agreed to roles, responsibilities, and qualifications for the State master anchors, local/regional anchors, and local assessors on the CLASS and ERS tool. In fall 2014, F5CA hired three master anchors who were then certified by the Environment Rating Scales Institute (ERSI) as State master anchors on each of the ERS tools by the end of 2014. At the same time, consortia made a concerted effort to establish a core group of local anchors in the ERS and reliable assessors on CLASS or contract with another entity to conduct their assessments in order to carry out the assessments required for rating. Consortia learned to work out cooperative arrangements while building internal capacity; while not a long term solution, these arrangements enabled consortia to meet targets for rating and monitoring. The newly hired State Master Anchors will focus on increasing local capacity and stability of assessors by working with each consortium to address local needs for ongoing training without incurring additional cost pressures.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Most significantly, over the course of the year, Consortia conversations shifted from a focus on rating to a focus about continuous quality improvement.

Following site recruitment, many consortia conducted preliminary evaluations of site strengths and areas for improvement to prioritize coaching and technical assistance (TA). Quality improvement efforts focused on acquainting sites with the overall Matrix and the tools associated with a TQRIS. A key accomplishment for many consortia was the hiring or contracting of coaches with early childhood education and experience and ensuring

these TA providers are adequately trained on the tools within the Framework. The Consortia worked independently and collaboratively to develop Continuous Quality Improvement Plans for use with participating programs. The Consortia began systematic delivery of professional development on the key tools and resources and coaches were assigned to work with sites, whether or not they had a formal assessed rating.

A significant accomplishment reported by consortia was establishing a network of coaches to support sites, assigning coaches to sites, and implementing a support system for those coaches. Coaches worked with sites to develop quality improvement plans, and the county's provision of training topics was, "a direct result of the data collected during coaching sessions and at the direct request of the participating sites (First 5 Santa Barbara County)." Coaches also focused efforts on building capacity of site directors. One consortium said,

> *Accomplishments also included the development of support systems and tools which promoted participating program directors to champion sustainable, continuous quality improvement at the program, site and classroom level. These support systems included a highly successful leadership academy series which enrolled over 100 participating ECE leaders, and providing a series of opportunities for directors to participate in trainings of trainers which address key early education elements including, DAP, ERS/CLASS, Strengthening Families, social/emotional development and change management.*
>
> - Orange County Office of Education

Staffing

In 2014, consortia were better prepared to staff appropriately. In fact, several consortia identified hiring staff or restructuring staff roles to ensure sufficient staffing as a key accomplishment in 2014. While most consortia partnered with other funded projects to carry out the communication and some aspects of service delivery, consortia members recognized dedicated staffs were necessary to carry out the goals of their RTT-ELC Action Plans. For example, some consortia found they needed to assign staff to outreach, recruit, and orient sites, while others determined they needed a full-time professional development coordinator. Every consortium worked to build capacity of assessors to carry out the CLASS and ERS assessments required for a rating beginning at Common Tier 3, though several consortiums' evaluation plans called for assessing every site for baseline information.

Grant Administration

- Supplemental Grant Award Notification - It was determined the majority of supplemental funds ($18,566,270 or 83 percent) would go to the Consortia to do the following:
    - Enroll (rate and support quality improvement) additional sites serving children with high needs into their RTT-ELC TQRIS; and
    - Provide leadership by mentoring 14 counties in the use of California's RTT-ELC Framework who either joined their mentor's TQRIS activities and QRIS or implemented their own local TQRIS.
- Consortia RTT-ELC Action Plans - Action Plans were updated to demonstrate how each consortium would use its supplemental funds and the increased number of participation sites.
- Statewide Investment Projects - The following have been accomplished:
- Workforce - California Early Childhood Mentor Directors were available to support identified centers or family child care homes using the Program Administration Scale (PAS) and the Business Administration

Scale (BAS). The expansion of Early Learning core curricula at California Community Colleges is in progress. Faculty convened a series of meetings and identified coursework on infants and toddlers, children with special needs, and program administration. The expansion of the "Core 8" with the three additional courses will fully support the workforce continuum. Participants have determined which courses properly align with the three selected topic areas. Agreement has been reached on the core content of each course and alignment work has begun. California Early Childhood Online (CECO) expanded its offerings of online courses on core resources, issuing of certificates. Online overviews of the Environment Rating Scales and each specific scale were made available on CECO with funding from F5CA. In 2014, RTT-ELC funds provided Spanish translations of the ERS modules in 2014 and a CSEFEL Overview and 3 R's of Early Childhood modules were added to the site. In 2014 there were nearly 6,000 users.

- Health - Training on developmental screening and screening tool sets were provided for local Consortia members. 196,644 children were screened. To promote social-emotional development, California adopted the teaching pyramid model. An online overview was created of the CSEFEL teaching pyramid (posted on CECO). To 2013's three consortia, seven more counties are engaged in adopting this model in 2014, and eight are scheduled for 2015. A network of CA CSEFEL trainers and coaches has been formed within the Consortia.
- Inter-agency Work - The California Department of Developmental Services (CDSS) supported the Consortia's use of developmental screeners. Through its contractor, WestEd Center for Prevention and Early Intervention, the CDSS developed Early Start online training modules demonstrating how children with developmental delays and disabilities can be served in QRIS programs and worked with each Consortium to develop Inclusion plans that are responsive to each consortium's needs. The California Department of Social Services initiated development of a series of educational and training e-learning training modules for consumers (families) and child care providers.
- TQRIS - American Institutes for Research (AIR) initiated work on the validation of the Consortia TQRIS. Its half-term report will be due to CDE in 2015. F5CA hired three master anchors for the assessment tools and formed an Assessor Management workgroup. F5CA will provide support for CLASS and ERS assessors and for inter-rater reliability training. As per California's application, "the CDE will provide oversight and work collaboratively with the entity charged with inter-rater reliability to ensure that each consortium has a comprehensive system for rating and monitoring that meets a high standard for inter-rater reliability in relation to application of the common elements and utilization of common tools and resources." As to measuring child outcomes, UC Berkeley is hosting the California Desired Results Developmental Profile-School Readiness (DRDP-SR) results in the "cloud" using DRDPtech. Several schools/districts are beginning to use the DRDP-SR for their transitional kindergarten and kindergarten programs. Because use of the instrument is voluntary, in 2014 additional outreach to districts in the Consortia was conducted to promote adoption of the instrument.

Lessons Learned

TQRIS

Flexibility and patience continued to be crucial in the third year of implementation. Recruitment and site readiness, complexities of developing robust TA and coaching supports, and overcoming barriers faced in hiring and assessing, were lessons that reminded implementers of the need for flexibility and patience. At the same time, the Consortia and the Implementation Team often revisited the delicate balance between being

responsive and flexible and upholding previous decisions. Consortia members reminded one another that the RTT-ELC is a pilot, which requires a look at local feasibility while still ensuring the pilot is able to collect consistent data about what is working for future considerations. Consortia weighed this principle carefully when implementation challenges arose and modifications were recommended. One consortium said,

> *Throughout this process, we have reminded ourselves this is a pilot program…we literally hit the ground running and sometimes found we didn't have the full understanding of why we were running in a certain direction. We learned that we needed to be flexible and make sure we were thoughtful with how we implemented because we were working with real programs and real families with children.*
>
> - First 5 Yolo County

As the Consortia began recruiting and working with early learning providers, new lessons learned emerged. The Consortia experienced the following:

Program Participation

Recruiting providers is not a one-size-fits-all model. Different incentives appeal to different providers. The Consortia learned, above all, relationships drive recruitment, retention, and commitment to quality improvement.

The Consortia also learned that providers need more direction and guidance in self-assessment and site improvement planning than anticipated. Building site readiness for assessment is a process that takes more than scheduling. Sites needed to understand the assessment tools and their purpose as supportive, (i.e., providing specific information for improvement) and more than a rating.

Furthermore, although the portfolio model of verifying most ratings is a hallmark of a high quality, efficient QRIS, it is not easily implemented. The portfolio model requires organization, resource sharing, and a level of understanding and commitment that takes time. Consortia found it necessary to start early in the year to orient and support staff commitment because if they delayed their assessment, many sites were on a summer schedule or were closed for the summer.

The structure of quarterly Consortia meetings changed in 2014 to include time set aside for consortia to share best practices and learn from one another; strategies are taken back to local consortium for customizing to local needs. For example a gallery walk of communication materials was included the September Consortia Meeting; feedback from that experience was overwhelmingly positive. The materials were then uploaded into the shared DropBox for future reference. Throughout the year, the liaisons have been instrumental in supporting consortia by research what other counties and states are doing and providing technical assistance through connections.

Rating and Monitoring

Recruiting and contracting with external, reliable assessors was more challenging than anticipated. Becoming “reliable” has taken more time and commitment on the part of assessors than expected. In this third year of implementation, consortia were overwhelmed with the cost of training an adequate number of reliable assessors, retaining assessors by paying a competitive rate, and scheduling (and often rescheduling) and carrying out assessments. While consortia worked together to share assessor resources, a lesson learned in efficiency, it was also a lesson learned in expedience. When a single assessor was used by several counties, wait time to schedule assessments became a factor in rating. By the end of 2014, a combination of assessor pools were used to balance cost and capacity: local, shared, and contracted.

Once assessors were trained and reliable, another important lesson learned was the need for assessor consistency and ongoing inter-rater reliability. As F5CA worked to establish Master Anchors, some consortia developed local practices to ensure their assessors had opportunities to meet regularly, come to agreement on rating practices, and conduct inter-rater reliability.

Continuous Quality Improvement

As the number of sites rated increased, consortia are learning about what types of support need to be provided by the local TQRIS and its coaches, and what types of strategies sites can implement themselves. They learned that the location of professional development matters and, as a result, restructured the location and frequency of group training to address issues of low attendance and participation. Consortia learned the benefit of a stronger engagement with community colleges and resource and referral agencies which enabled the local TQRIS to increase the number of high quality professional development offerings, better support higher education attainment through cohort classes, and bring more intellectual capital to the table when developing tools and resources for providers and coaches.

Consortia also learned the importance of program alignment and integration to better support continuous quality improvement and the importance of clear and consistent messaging about what continuous quality improvement means. Continuous Quality Improvement cannot be implemented in a one size fits-all manner. Consortia learned:

- Programs often have a hard time shifting from the idea of improvement as a checklist of discrete activities to a continuous process.
- Providing release time to teachers for coaching, training, and reflective practice is key to success, particularly in programs unable to ask teachers to stay beyond the beginning and end of the program day due to contract limitations.
- Family child care providers need a different level of support than centers to keep them motivated and encouraged as they implement new strategies and protocols for improvement, which can be overwhelming.

A third important lesson was the importance of how coaches share assessment and rating results with sites, especially when the ERS and CLASS were used by these sites for improvement rather than rating prior to RTT-ELC. In addition, clearly communicating with sites a consortium's plans for publicly sharing rating was an important part of both continuous quality improvement and program retention.

Stakeholders and Partnerships

The Consortia learned that maintaining engagement of key stakeholders in the community, including representatives from the early learning profession (public and private), community agencies, county agencies, and higher education institutions, was key in RTT-ELC implementation. Shared training, regular meetings, and explicit scopes of work were essential to maintaining a shared mission. Consortia also found it takes time to think through the development of a robust system because of the different agency infrastructures and different levels of capacity including delivery systems, such as mental health and inclusion supports that do not have explicit place on the rating scale, was also seen as important to the sustainability of a TQRIS.

The development of partnerships at the local level allows the Consortia members to use shared resources to maximize efficiencies and effectiveness. In the Bay Area, for example, five consortia came together to form a

Bay Area Regional QRIS Partnership (BAQRISP) and developed communication tools to reach a variety of stakeholders, including educators, parents, and policy makers.

The partnerships between the Implementation Team and the Consortia, as well as across local consortia and regions, are extremely valuable and powerful. The consistency in planning and the ability to bring local feedback up to the state level impacted change and direction. The Implementation Team provided the Consortia with relevant and timely research regarding nationwide TQRIS implementation and provided summaries about the advances in the science of early childhood education. The Consortia stated that participation in the Implementation Team facilitated work groups was highly useful in creating a community of learners. They gained significant expertise from each other, especially regarding local policies and challenges experienced by larger counties or counties where a TQRIS had been operating. As a result, local efforts and local TQRIS have benefited from the full Consortia expertise around implementing the three common tiers, the Pathways, evaluation, and other TQRIS essentials.

These partnerships will go a long way in addressing the demand for QRIS services and participation. Several consortia mentioned this lesson learned when, for the first time in 2014, they have a wait list of interested sites. Consortia are beginning to map out a plan for inclusion of more private centers and family child care providers.

Challenges and Strategies to Address Challenges

As noted in California's application, implementation of RTT-ELC standards must address the diverse and unique needs of our vast state. Inherent in any implementation of this scale are logistical challenges, including effective communications, gaining and sustaining buy-in and engagement, and working within the bounds of multiple agencies and stakeholders. Although partnering with other funded projects was a priority for the Consortia, and many were successful in leveraging resources and TA, competing evaluation requirements caused significant challenges for many consortia.

Development Process and Group Planning

While the Implementation Team learned from their experiences in 2013 regarding the time involved in Consortia decision-making, reaching consensus within the Consortia continued to be a time-consuming process for the Team to facilitate.

> **Strategies:** The Implementation Team utilized past experience to more realistically plan meetings, agendas, and communicate with the Consortia. A new agenda format and regular meetings of the liaisons assigned to each county facilitated troubleshooting and enabled more expedited handling of issues.

Program Participation

Although most consortia reported success in recruiting programs to their TQRIS, the focus in 2014 was on challenges with specific types of providers:

- The education requirement is a barrier to family child care participation and improvement.
- Outreach and recruitment of programs serving families whose care is subsidized by child care vouchers also proved challenging because of limited access to data allowing the county to identify those programs.
- Dual language programs are hesitant to participate because they do not believe the matrix (and tools used within it) represents best practice for English Language Learners.

Once recruited, the Consortia experienced challenges in maintaining site engagement. Some consortia experienced fluctuation in program participation due to site closure (sequestration and reduced state funding) and other programs expressed concern with the TQRIS requirements and local improvement processes. Family child care programs required more coaching and support resources and tended to drop out due to being overwhelmed and discouraged a low rating.

Strategies: Some consortia found that conducting an initial interview with sites helped programs to understand the benefits and challenges of participating in TQRIS. Partnering with the local resource and referral agency and a Family Child Care Home Education Network has helped other consortia recruit and support sites.

Rating and Monitoring Process and Data Systems

Multiple capacity issues continued to create challenges in fully implementing the assessment and rating process to establish an initial rating for existing sites. By far, the most significant challenge in 2014 was the difficulty in finding enough reliable, independent assessors needed to complete the ERS and CLASS assessments. In particular, establishing a cadre of reliable ERS assessors was challenging and costly for most consortia. The cost of training is significant and, once trained, assessors may be unavailable when they are shared among consortia or leave for higher pay. One consortium said,

> *The Environment Rating Scales (ERS - as currently implemented as part of the RTT-ELC QRIS) poses significant financial and human resource challenges that threaten the overall viability of the QRIS in California. The ERS, as currently implemented, is not scalable due to financial constraints related to the cost of maintain 90% reliability on a proprietary tool.*
>
> • First 5 Contra Costa County

The development of full implementation of the local database continued to be a problem for a few consortia. While consortia have implemented data systems, extracting data that is useful for both the state and local needs has been challenging.

Strategies: Consortia implemented a variety of methods to insure they had reliable assessors. F5CA, under its RTT-ELC Inter-Rater Reliability contract, supported the ERS Institute to provide training on the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale (FCCERS) for one anchor in each consortium. F5CA also offered several trainings on each of the CLASS tools in locations around the state. Consortia also met their assessor needs through partnering with other counties, hiring local assessors on staff, and contracting with another agency to conduct the assessments.

In addition, the Assessor Management Workgroup (formerly the Rating and Monitoring Workgroup) discussed the ERS challenges and brought a recommendation to consortia at the December 2014 Consortia Meeting. Consortia agreed to look at possible modifications ERS use and rating and will bring a recommendation to the March 2015 Consortia Meeting.

Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Process

Noting the research on coaching for continuous quality improvement, several consortia identified lack of resources to hire and train coaches to meet the coaching needs of participating early learning sites. One consortium said,

> *There is little information and resources within California to identify and build coaching competencies, dispositions, and core content knowledge.* - First 5 San Francisco County

Although many consortia collaborated with partner agencies to share coaching responsibilities, several consortia experienced challenges in creating supports for training and supervision of coaches to maintain standards of quality across these different agencies.

Teacher turnover in centers was another challenge - when staff changes, there is a need for rerating, retraining, and work toward quality can be impacted. Similarly, when coaches move to other jobs, there are retraining requirements that cause both a fiscal impact and a delay in meeting program quality improvement support.

While fewer counties expressed the degree of challenge previously identified with regard to building the capacity of training opportunities that support the continuous quality improvement (CQI) process, in 2014, there were still some challenges with ERS and CLASS certification and developing trainers for Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) and the California Collaborative for the Social-Emotional Foundations of Early Learning (CSEFEL). Many consortia still struggled with additional issues with regard to costs and minimum attendance requirements, geographical isolation, the diversity of languages spoken by providers, and capacity building due to training parameters.

While some consortia expressed strong partnerships with higher education institutions, others noted challenges, often due to several years of budget cuts, in engaging the community college and state university systems to align coursework with the evolving and emerging best practices from the national movement to create TQRIS. Moreover, there is a general shortage of higher education options for monolingual Spanish speaking providers.

> **Strategies:** At the local level, consortia continued to work on developing and ensuring strong partnerships with professional development stakeholders across the service delivery system as a key to building a foundation for successful CQI implementation. Local consortia developed their own coaching standards and dispositions and formed learning communities to address the consistency and quality issues.

Consortia Staffing and Contracts

Staff turnover and hiring was less of a problem in 2014 than it was in 2013. However, with a more multi-faceted and comprehensive final TQRIS model than originally anticipated, the Consortia reported being challenged to have sufficient funds to rate, coach, evaluate, and administer a TQRIS with such ambitious goals.

> **Strategies:** Several consortia determined that adding internal staff rather than contracting out was a more efficient and effective way to implement the project. To support local implementation and reduction of local costs, the CDE revised the initial scope of the Inter-Rater Reliability project and contracted with F5CA to implement an Assessor Management system that supports state-level master anchors.

Successful State Systems

Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State (Section A(3) of Application)

Governance Structure

Please provide any relevant information and updates related to the governance structure for the RTT-ELC State Plan (specifically, please include information on the organizational structure for managing the grant, and the governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, State Advisory Council, and Participating State Agencies).

During 2014, California's RTT-ELC governance structure continued to function as illustrated in the organizational chart, which was described in California's approved application. As stated in previous reports, this structure builds on California's strategy of inter-agency collaboration and governance and provides opportunities to further strengthen and enhance this strategy through the RTT-ELC grant. With active participation from the various state agencies and the Early Learning Challenge Regional Leadership Consortia (Consortia), California is creating channels to improve and align state and local systems that serve children with high needs, ages zero to five years.

When referring to the Consortia, it means the representatives involved in the 17 local Consortia. The representatives include the Key Decision-makers (the person within the consortium who has the authority to make the final decisions) as well as program and fiscal staff. The Consortia is the decision-making body with guidance from the state RTT-ELC Implementation Team on issues involving local implementation, specifically the Quality Continuum Framework and decisions are reached using a consensus approach.

The following subsections describe the major organizational levels and discuss 2014 key activities and/or functions.

California Administration: Office of the Governor, State Board of Education (SBE), and California Department of Education (CDE)

Representatives from the Governor's Administration [Department of Finance (DOF) and SBE] continued to be involved in major policy issues pertaining to RTT-ELC. In 2014, in addition to receiving periodic updates and developing California's early learning program budgets, they participated in drafting legislation as part of California's fiscal year 2014-15 Budget Act process (Trailer Bill - Senate Bill 858) to establish a state Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) Block Grant program. This program is to be allocated to consortia for support of local early learning quality rating and improvement systems that increase the number of low-income children in high-quality state preschool programs. DOF and SBE also provided guidance in the development of the Request for Application (RFA) that will be distributed to potential local consortia in early 2015. This legislation will be more fully discussed in the Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders section.

Within the CDE, the Early Education and Support Division (EESD) continues to lead the RTT-ELC grant activities in partnership with First 5 California (F5CA), another state agency. Throughout 2014, the RTT-ELC Leadership Team consisted of the EESD's Deputy Superintendent (Lupita Cortez Alcalá), Director (Debra McMannis), F5CA Executive Director (Camille Maben), Administrator for the EESD's Quality Improvement Office (Cecelia Fisher-Dahms), and First 5 California's Deputy Director, Program Management Division (Sarah Neville-Morgan). This Leadership Team directs the RTT-ELC Implementation Team, which consists of staff from the CDE and F5CA, in carrying out the various tasks associated with the grant. This partnership continued to model state agency

coordination and collaboration between the two agencies that have the major responsibility for serving this child population in early learning and care settings.

State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care (SAC)

In 2014, the SAC held three in-person meetings (January, June, and October) and one statewide teleconference (April). This Council is co-chaired by Pete Cervinka, Program Deputy Director, Benefits and Services, California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and Debra McMannis, Director, EESD, CDE. The SAC members represent a broad range of state and local agencies and organizations with a stake in the early childhood field, including education, social services, health and mental health, and higher education. One of the governor's appointees also administers a RTT-ELC consortium and serves as a liaison between the SAC and the Consortia. Another appointee formerly administered a consortium and continues to provide a RTT-ELC perspective to the SAC.

The SAC agendas focused on various topics pertaining to the education and care of young children. The major discussions centered on: state and federal updates, emphasizing legislative, regulatory, and budget information; funding resources and reimbursement rates for state-contracted early learning and care programs; importance of higher education training a highly qualified professional staff to work in these programs; exploring simplification of state and local program administration; professional development needs of early learning and care staff; and information about the various new funding opportunities announced at the federal and state levels, such as, the Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership, the Preschool Expansion Grant, and the state's QRIS Block Grant. In May 2014, the SAC sent a letter to Governor Brown offering early learning and care fiscal, administrative, and workforce input. The California Comprehensive Early Learning Plan released by the SAC in 2013, provided the foundation for the items addressed in the letter.

This Council is an important communication conduit to convey RTT-ELC information and progress to other constituents involved in the administration of California's early learning and care programs. The communication message stresses the importance of continuous quality program improvement that results in children with high needs receiving quality learning and services to better prepare them for kindergarten and ultimately for life.

RTT-ELC Implementation Team

As stated under the subsection, California Administration: Office of the Governor, State Board of Education (SBE), and California Department of Education (CDE), the Implementation Team (Team) consisting of staff from the CDE and F5CA continued to be the key body that plans and implements the RTT-ELC grant in compliance with California's approved application. As a result of receiving the 2013 Supplemental Funds, the CDE hired three limited-term staff members in early 2014 to augment the Team.

The Team is charged with carrying out the day-to-day administration of the grant and met weekly to plan upcoming tasks and/or meetings, to make staff assignments, and to communicate/discuss progress, issues, policy clarification, and other pertinent information. In addition, the Team supported the work of the Integrated Action Team (IAT) and oversaw 11 contracts or inter-agency agreements that enhance the ability to strengthen the quality of local early learning and care programs.

As reported in 2013, the largest portion of the Team's time was supporting the Consortia. Again in 2014, the majority of time was devoted to the Consortia. These efforts included the following ongoing tasks: facilitating four Consortia in-person meetings and several conference calls and/or webinars; refining the Hybrid Rating Matrix created collaboratively by the Consortia with state involvement in 2012; serving as Consortia liaisons in assisting the Consortia with grant implementation at the local level; reviewing and approving Action Plan amendments, budget amendments, expenditure reports, and Annual Performance Reports; monitoring; and

providing training and technical assistance. The list of the Consortia and their administering agencies is provided below in the subsection entitled RTT-ELC Regional Leadership Consortia.

In addition to the ongoing tasks, the Team accomplished the following major activities in 2014:

- **Mentee TQRIS Counties** - With the addition of the Supplemental Funds, 14 non RTT-ELC counties became "Mentees" of existing RTT-ELC Consortia (for a list of the mentee counties, please refer to the subsection below entitled RTT-ELC Regional Leadership Consortia). The Mentees are at varying stages of implementing a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS), from being interested in establishing one to having already developed a local rating system. They were all required to adopt the RTT-ELC TQRIS matrix. The Mentee representatives were invited to attend the Consortia meetings and received all RTT-ELC communiques sent from the state. With the Mentees, California now has a RTT-ELC presence in 30 of its 58 counties, which represents 95 percent of the state's population.

- **Consortia Fiscal Accountability Policy (CFAP)** - To ensure the Consortia are appropriately expending RTT-ELC funds in a timely manner, CFAP was developed to provide direction for accountability and released in June 2014. It established a threshold for unspent funds that could possibly trigger a delay of the next quarterly disbursement of funds and/or a reallocation of funds to another consortium. It also suggested spending alternatives that were in keeping with California's application and the Consortia Action Plans.

  In October 2014, the CFAP was amended to accommodate the new timelines associated with the federal no-cost time extension (once federal approval is given). The amendments changed the Consortia grant end date from December 31, 2015, to June 30, 2016, and raised the unspent threshold for 2015.

  The liaisons were charged with the responsibility of carefully monitoring all budgets and fiscal reports for their assigned consortia. The liaisons also were required to make recommendations to the RTT-ELC Leadership Team if a disbursement delay or reallocation of funds is warranted for a particular consortium.

On-Site Consortia Validation Visits - In the fall of 2014, the five liaisons visited their assigned consortia. Using a modified form of the federal monitoring protocol that was conducted on RTT-ELC states as a guide, the liaisons visited each consortium's office site to perform a validation visit to determine compliance with their approved Action Plan, including a review of appropriate documentation. As part on these visits, the liaisons attended either a local RTT-ELC participating program site, a RTT-ELC advisory board meeting, a regional RTT-ELC Consortia meeting that included mentees, or a stakeholder/partnership meeting. Follow-up reports will be sent to the Consortia in early 2015. The liaisons felt these on-site visits to be extremely valuable in determining compliance and to see firsthand the progress made in improving the quality of early learning and care programs.

Survey of Meeting Format - In California, the Team facilitates three major quarterly meetings: (1) Consortia meetings for Consortia and Mentee representatives, (2) Consortia Key Decision-makers only meetings, and (3) Integrated Action Team meetings for Consortia representatives and Participating State Agencies. To maximize travel and meeting time, a survey presenting four options of different configurations of meeting arrangements was developed and taken to determine the participants' preferences. The preferred option was to schedule a two-day meeting in Sacramento. On the first day, the Integrated Action Team will meet for three hours from 9:00 a.m. to noon, and the Consortia Key Decision-makers only will meet from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. On the second (next) day, Consortia, including the Key Decision-makers, and Mentees will meet from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. This new scheduling format will commence at the March 2015 meeting.

Early Learning Challenge Integrated Action Team (IAT)

The Integrated Action Team consists of representatives from Participating State Agencies (PSAs), the Consortia, and the Implementation Team. This body is charged with active coordination on an implementation level of the key activities and initiatives described in California's RTT-ELC application.

In 2014, the IAT reaffirmed the goal statement and priority work areas that were developed and adopted in 2013. These statements are as follows:

- **Goal Statement**

  The goal of the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Integrated Action Team (IAT) is to support state and local systems to successfully coordinate and streamline services to children from birth to age five, with a focus on the needs of the whole child and his or her family. The IAT will facilitate effective interfaces and communication strategies to better serve this population.

- **Priority Work Areas**
  1. Developmental Screening and Follow-up Coordination, and Inclusion of Children with Special Needs - **Child Focus**
  2. Educate and Encourage Families to Select Quality Programs, and Licensing Coordination - **Family Focus**
  3. Coordination of Classroom and Site-level Assessment Tools - **Program Focus**

Three in-person meetings were held in 2014. The agendas included standing items covering updates from the PSAs and time for workgroups to address the three priority areas. The update portion of the agenda included a presentation from the California Department of Public Health, California Home Visiting Program Branch on California's Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (CECCS) grant. The IAT also serves as a partner and advisory body to this grant, thus fostering streamlining and aligning statewide systems and programs.

At the June 2014 meeting, the IAT received a special presentation on the California Child Care Research Partnership Grant Program. Holli Tonyan, Ph.D, California State University, Northridge and Susan Savage Ph.D, Child Care Resource Center presented the preliminary results of their federally-funded research project. This project examined the conditions under which family child care providers in the Los Angeles County (Service Planning Areas 1, 2, and 6) and San Bernardino County adopt and sustain changes in their daily routine activities in response to quality improvement activities in the context of the Race to the Top -- Early Learning Challenge.

IAT participants expressed a keen interest in having Dr. Tonyan and Dr. Savage return at a future IAT meeting to present further data and findings as the project entered its next phase. Drs. Tonyan and Savage provided an update at the December 2014 IAT meeting. These data and findings helped IAT participants to better understand the issues of family child care providers and how to effectively relate to them when working to improve quality services in their homes.

Also at the June meeting, dialogue began to explore how to make the IAT meetings more relevant to the participants given the reality of busy schedules and the constraint of time. This dialogue was continued in two conference calls - one exclusively for the PSAs and the other for Consortia representatives. At the December meeting, summaries of the two conference calls were presented and consensus was reached on how to go forward with the IAT meetings. The decisions reached were to continue with in-person meetings, continue working on the previously adopted priorities (refer to the subsection entitled Early Learning Challenge Integrated Action Team for these priorities), and agree to work on only one or two doable (achievable) items

within each priority area. To implement these decisions, it was decided to start with licensing issues in Priority 2 as licensing involves the majority of IAT participants. The IAT will identify one or two licensing issues to tackle in early 2015. Once these issues are resolved, then the IAT will progress to determining doable items in the other priority areas.

RTT-ELC Regional Leadership Consortia

In California, the goal of improving the quality of early learning programs for children with high needs and their families continued to be largely dependent on the performance of the 17 Consortia in 16 counties. In 2014 the 17 Consortia were joined by 14 Mentee counties to work toward achieving this goal in their respective counties.

Table I lists the county and corresponding Consortia administering agency. Table II indicates the Mentee Counties with their corresponding administering agencies and Consortia Mentor(s).

Table I – Seventeen Consortia

California County: Consortia Administering Agency

1. Alameda: First 5 Alameda
2. Contra Costa: First 5 Contra Costa
3. El Dorado: First 5 El Dorado
4. Fresno: Fresno County Office of Education
5. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Office of Child Care
6. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Universal Preschool
7. Merced: Merced County Office of Education
8. Orange: Orange County Office of Education
9. Sacramento: Sacramento County Office of Education
10. San Diego: First 5 San Diego
11. San Francisco: First 5 San Francisco
12. San Joaquin: First 5 San Joaquin
13. Santa Barbara: First 5 Santa Barbara
14. Santa Clara: First 5 Santa Clara
15. Santa Cruz: First 5 Santa Cruz
16. Ventura: First 5 Ventura
17. Yolo: First 5 Yolo

Table II – Fourteen Mentee Counties and Their Consortia Mentors

California County: Mentee Administering Agency; Consortia Mentor(s)

1. Imperial: Imperial County Office of Education; Mentors: Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Ventura
2. Kern: Early Childhood Council of Kern; Mentor: Fresno
3. Kings: Kings County Office of Education; Mentor: Fresno
4. Madera: Merced County Office of Education; Mentor: Merced
5. Mariposa: Merced County Office of Education; Mentor: Merced
6. Nevada: Placer County Office of Education; Mentors: El Dorado, Sacramento, San Joaquin and Yolo

7. Placer: Placer County Office of Education; Mentors: El Dorado, Sacramento, San Joaquin and Yolo
8. Riverside: First 5 Riverside; Mentors: Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, Santa Barbara and Ventura
9. San Bernardino: First 5 San Bernardino; Mentors: Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, Santa Barbara and Ventura
10. San Luis Obispo: Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo County; Mentor: Santa Barbara
11. San Mateo: First 5 San Mateo and San Mateo County office of Education; Mentors: Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz
12. Sierra: Placer County Office of Education; Mentors: El Dorado, Sacramento, San Joaquin and Yolo
13. Stanislaus: Stanislaus County Office of Education; Mentor: San Joaquin
14. Tulare: Tulare County Office of Education; Mentor: Fresno

The Consortia and Mentees used the TQRIS developed by the Consortia in 2012 and refined in 2013 and 2014. Refinement of the TQRIS is an important ongoing task, driven by the Consortia and supported by the Implementation Team. Refinement happens as opportunities emerge to clarify or modify for consistency Consortia wide. For example, in 2014 the Consortia Assessor Management workgroup (formerly called the Rating and Monitoring workgroup) worked to develop recommendations for Consortia approval on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System® (CLASS®) and environment rating scales (ERS). These modifications centered on the Hybrid Rating Matrix elements 4 and 2 respectively, when using the CLASS® tool in multi-age classrooms and the scores for infants, along with acceptable evidence to document scores for developmental health screening. The use of ERS, element 6, was examined and the Consortia reached consensus to keep the ERS on the Hybrid Rating Matrix. The Consortia proposed possible modifications to the use of ERS. An Ad Hoc workgroup will be formed in early 2015 to explore options and possibly develop recommendations for modified use of the ERS for Consortia approval. It is the Implementation Team's intent to support the Consortia in this objective with national support as well as research based assistance, as needed.

Throughout 2014, quarterly Consortia meetings were held for Consortia and Mentee representatives facilitated by the Implementation Team. Major topics of discussion focused on: inter-rated reliability, specifically for ERS; recruitment and retention of local early learning providers, especially family child care providers; updates and discussion on California's RTT-ELC independent evaluation; sustainability following the grant; and, fiscal issues with special emphasis on the CFAP.

Two new additions were initiated during the 2014 Consortia meetings. The first was establishing specific time on the agenda for peer sharing. Some of the topics covered were integrating local library literacy programs with RTT-ELC providers, a gallery walk displaying various coaching techniques and use of pathways, and marketing TQRIS and provider rating scores. The peer sharing time received excellent support and positive comments from the meeting participants.

The second addition was formalizing the Key Decision-makers meeting time within the Consortia meeting day. They expressed an interest and need to meet exclusively among themselves to discuss board policy issues and areas of implementation. These meetings also received positive comments and resulted in the Key Decision-makers requesting more time for discussion. This request was one of the reasons that led to reformatting the meeting schedule described above in the subsection entitled Survey of Meeting Format. As a result of the

survey, the Key Decision-makers will meet for three hours the day before the full Consortia meeting starting in 2015.

At the September 2014 Consortia meeting, a special presentation on Practice-based Coaching, Aligning Practice, Supports and Resources to Improve Early Learning Program Quality by Dr. Gail Joseph was given. This outstanding presentation centered on supporting high-quality programs by collaborative coaching partnerships that use shared goals and action planning, focused observations, and reflection and feedback. The Consortia participants were very receptive to Dr. Joseph's message and gained a deeper understanding of how to strengthen coaching practices within their consortia. Coaching is a universal strategy employed by all 17 Consortia.

Stakeholder Involvement

Describe State progress in involving representatives from Participating Programs, Early Childhood Educators or their representatives, parents and families, including parents and families of Children with High Needs, and other key stakeholders in the implementation of the activities carried out under the grant.

As stated in California's 2013 report, there are numerous entities throughout California that are involved and/or keenly interested in early learning and care programs/initiatives for young children. A sampling of these entities include legislative and regulatory governmental bodies, state agencies, professional organizations, advocacy groups, foundations, early learning and care program providers, higher education personnel, and general interested parties. California's RTT-ELC grant is clearly one of the programs these entities are interested in understanding the program goals, the design, and how it is being implemented. They want to know if quality programs for children with high needs have increased in California and what are the child outcomes. Consequently, many strategies for communicating this information must be employed.

In the early days of the grant, the Implementation Team developed Fact Sheets and a Web site as well as convened or attended a variety of meetings to educate stakeholders, partners, and practitioners about RTT-ELC. In 2014, these activities continued. However, the emphasis focused more on how the Consortia are implementing their grants and what are the initial successes, challenges, and lessons learned. Stakeholder involvement focused on how the TQRIS achieves the desired child outcomes and how early learning staffs are improving their staff-child interactions. They provided timely feedback to the Consortia and Implementation Team from their expertise and perspective.

Members of the Implementation Team have permanent seats on various state councils, such as the California Statewide Screening Collaborative and the Strengthening Families Leaders Alliance. By having ongoing involvement on statewide bodies, this participation helps in meeting the RTT-ELC goal of aligning state systems as well as transmitting RTT-ELC information and receiving input on various aspects of program implementation.

Team members also gave numerous presentations to a variety of groups throughout the year, both within the state and at national conferences. In March 2014, two members of the State Leadership Team provided background information on California's RTT-ELC to the Los Angeles Policy Roundtable for Child Care and Development. In July, members of the Implementation Team and RTT-ELC county representatives presented several workshops at the BUILD QRIS national conference, “It takes a village to screen a child: Developmental Screening as an essential element of the Early Learning System” and “QRIS Systems-Building: Lessons from RTT-ELC.” Similarly in September, team members and county representatives presented on developmental screening at the state Joint Resource and Referral Alternate Payment fall conference. Likewise, in September, an overview

of California's RTT-ELC was provided at the Child Development Training Consortium's Annual Conference. In November, team members and county representatives presented on California's unique approach to TQRIS at the National Association for the Education of Young children's Conference. In December, team members and county representatives presented at the Zero to Three National Conference on developmental screening.

At the local level, the Consortia were also engaged in interacting with a variety of stakeholder and partner groups. Their groups generally involved parent groups, county or city officials, county offices of education and school districts, First 5 county commissions, child care resource and referral agencies, local child care planning councils, tribal and migrant organizations, local early learning providers, and business representatives. When appropriate, members of these groups participated in local RTT-ELC advisory boards, workgroups, and general meetings.

The Consortia were surveyed on the strategies used in 2014 to involve local stakeholders and partners. The results showed the following strategies used in rank order: (1) 14 (82 percent) established a permanent advisory group, (2) 13 (77 percent) established additional local workgroups or held regional meetings, (3) 11 (65 percent) held stakeholder key informant interviews to get input into the TQRIS or integrated TQRIS into existing memoranda of understanding and agreements.

Other specific strategies that several Consortia employed were:

- Held regular meetings with school readiness coordinators (Sacramento)
- Supported and implemented the Roadmap to Kindergarten program that assists families during children's transition to kindergarten (Contra Costa)
- Interacted on a regular basis with local health care collaboratives (San Joaquin)
- Provided ongoing reports to Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors' Policy Roundtable for Child Care and Development and the Child Care Planning Committee (Los Angeles County Office of Child Care)
- Implemented Engaging Families as Partners program with participating families (San Diego)

Consortia were also surveyed to determine the types of participating partners and stakeholders they involved in their local consortium. One hundred percent (100%) of the Consortia reported they involved First 5 county commissions, county offices of education, child care planning councils, and institutions of higher education.

Other participating partners and stakeholders include:

- School districts: 16 (94%)
- Alternative Payment Programs: 16 (94%)
- Child Development Program representatives: 16 (94%)
- Head Start Grantees: 16 (94%)
- Resource and Referral Agencies: 16 (94%)
- Early Head Start Grantees: 15 (88%)
- Non-profits or other agencies providing services for children birth to age five: 15 (88%)
- County Health and Human Services including Child Welfare Services, Welfare to Work, Women Infant and Children, etc.: 12 (71%)
- Local Home Visiting Program: 12 (71%)
- Migrant and Tribal Child Care Program: 12 (71%).

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had or will have an impact on the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact and any anticipated changes to the RTT-ELC State Plan as a result.

2014-15 Budget and Legislative Update

The primary changes related to early learning and support programs in California in the 2014-15 fiscal year came as a part of the state budget. Some funds were restored from previous years' cuts and new funding became available for expansion.

Restoration and Expansion Funding

- Restoration of 7,500 full-day/full-year slots in existing California State Preschool Programs (CSPP). Children and families began receiving services on or before October 1, 2014. A total of 10,297 full-day and part-day slots were funded.
- Restoration of 1,000 slots in existing General Child Care Programs, with a priority for infants and toddlers. The CDE was able to fund 1,346 slots and children began receiving services by December 1, 2014.
- Increase the capacity of the CSPP with 4,000 additional slots in new or existing programs. Letters of intent indicated a statewide request of 32,301 slots. Funding awards will be announced in March 2015 and children will begin receiving services in July 2015.

Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) Block Grants

- $50 million in annual block grants is allocated on an ongoing basis to support the CSPP.
- The QRIS Block Grant RFA will be allocated to local consortia for support of local early learning QRIS that increase the number of low-income children in high quality CSPPs that prepare those children for success in school and life. The California State Superintendent of Public Instruction will base funding on the number of CSPP slots in the county or region.
- Award of funding announcements will be made in February 2015.
- This Block Grant builds upon the ongoing efforts of the RTT-ELC grant in that the TQRIS developed by the Consortia is required to be used by those approved CSPP applicants.
- The Block Grant will also help sustain the efforts of the RTT-ELC grant in the CSPP when the RTT-ELC grant sunsets.
- California's early learning agencies who are approved for this grant are committed to serving approximately 53,700 preschool children. As the grant continues to grow in future years, it has the potential of serving approximately 136,100 preschoolers.

Transitional Kindergarten (TK)

- $15 million for stipends for TK and CSPP teachers to be reimbursed for educational expenses
- $10 million to develop and provide professional learning on developmentally appropriate TK practices for TK teachers.

In California schools, this TK funding has the potential of impacting approximately 8,100 teachers who teach approximately 80,000 children enrolled in TK programs. These numbers were derived from the fiscal year 2014-15 Census Day data reported by school districts. These teachers will benefit from focused professional development training on developmentally appropriate TK practices for their students and to receive stipends for their educational expenses.

Reimbursement Rates

- A five percent increase to the Standard Reimbursement Rate effective July 1, 2014, for state-contracted center based programs and family child care home networks
- An increase to the 2009 Regional Market Rate Ceilings, minus 10.11 percent, with a hold-harmless clause for ceilings higher at the previous 2005 levels effective January 1, 2015, for California Alternative Payment Program providers.

AB 2621 (Garcia) requires the CDSS Community Care Licensing (CCL) to post licensing information on its website for child day care facilities and adds a requirement to update this information on at least a monthly basis.

Participating State Agencies

Describe any changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in the State Plan.

California's PSAs [California Department of Social Services (CDSS), California Department of Developmental Services (CDDS), California Department of Public Health (CDPH), the SAC, F5CA, and SBE] continued their involvement in the RTT-ELC grant as defined in their scopes of work. Four of the PSAs have an interagency agreement with the CDE to complete tasks associated with their area of expertise that will enhance or support raising the quality of early learning programs. The CDPH completed its task of proving infant & toddler training to home visiting personnel. The CDSS is using RTT-ELC funds to improve its licensing Web site to include educational and training materials for consumers and child care providers. This will provide more consistent understanding of licensing requirements where consumers and child care providers will see the site as a resource where they can get information about quality. The CDDS is meeting its interagency agreement by coordinating training for early intervention program staff and support implementation of best practices in developmental and health screening at the local level in collaboration with the Consortia. F5CA is using RTT-ELC funds to develop a system of master anchors to provide support for CLASS® and ERS assessors and for inter-rater reliability training. This inter-agency agreement with F5CA is in addition to F5CA's contribution of allocating staff resources to the Leadership and Implementation Teams.

All of the above mentioned PSAs along with California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the State Interagency Coordinating Council for Part C of IDEA are members of the IAT and received IAT communiques and other pertinent information pertaining to RTT-ELC. IAT participants, consisting of representatives from Participating State Agencies (PSAs), the Consortia, and the Implementation Team, spent several meeting discussing their role and information-sharing. This meeting will be held in early 2015. At that meeting, the Memorandum of Understanding and Scope of Work each signed and completed in early 2012 by the PSAs will be reviewed in addition to the reaffirmation/clarification of their role and re-establishment of communication channels and procedures.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application)

During the current year, has the State made progress in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include—

(1) Early Learning & Development Standards	
Yes or No	Yes
Early Learning & Development Standards that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System	
Yes or No	Yes
A Comprehensive Assessment System that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications	
Yes or No	Yes
Early Childhood Educator qualifications that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

(4) Family engagement strategies	
Yes or No	Yes
Family engagement strategies that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

(5) Health promotion practices	
Yes or No	Yes
Health promotion practices that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

(6) Effective data practices	
Yes or No	Yes
Effective data practices that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

The State has made progress in ensuring that:	
TQRIS Program Standards are measurable	✓
TQRIS Program Standards meaningfully differentiate program quality levels	✓
TQRIS Program Standards reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children	✓
The TQRIS is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs	✓

Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.

In 2014, California continued to implement the Quality Continuum Framework based on tools and resources from the original Framework that was described in its application. The Framework includes common, research-based elements, tools, and resources grouped into three core areas: (1) Child Development and School Readiness, (2) Teachers and Teaching, and (3) Program and Environment. California's Matrix combines a block system at lower levels with points at higher tiers.

The Rating and Monitoring Work group, consisting of Consortia members, experts, practitioners, and Implementation Team staff, had served as the primary vehicle for examining issues and making recommendations on changes to the Hybrid Rating Matrix. During 2014, this group transitioned into an Assessor Management Workgroup and added new members. This change reflected a move from planning and early implementation of the Matrix to a fully operational phase, requiring more oversight and consistency among assessors and processes for rating. More detail on the work this group has accomplished can be found in the section “Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs” (Section B(3) of Application).

Two substantive changes were made to the Matrix in two of the core areas. The first core area of Child Development and School Readiness, three new tools were approved for use in the Child Observation element for the 3-point value. Participating sites can now choose among three different child observation tools, all of which are aligned with California's Early Learning Foundations. The second core area, Effective Teacher-Child Interactions element (element 4), a new assessment tool was added, the CLASS Infant. This tool is now being used to rate and provide quality improvement in sites serving infants, and includes cut-off scores at the higher point values. The CLASS Infant scores parallel the cut-off scores that were previously set for the CLASS Pre-K and Toddler. Recommended scores were discussed with Teachstone and approved by the Consortia at the December 2014 meeting.

One significant challenge to implementing California's TQRIS has been the incorporation of the ERS tools with high standards for external assessors. Sufficient capacity to assess all participating sites across the state has been a struggle to achieve and maintain, although the Consortia has made progress. In particular, many found that forming partnerships with other local entities has been helpful. Despite that, many of the consortia still cited issues such as finding and maintaining a sufficient number of reliable assessors, coordinating assessment schedules with sites and assessors, and cost. They also noted that these issues will hinder scalability and sustainability of the TQRIS. These continuing challenges prompted the Consortia to revisit the Environment Rating Scales element in the Matrix on multiple occasions. In January 2014, the Rating and Monitoring Workgroup met via webinar to discuss options for revising that element, however decided to wait for evaluation

results before making any changes. In December 2014, the entire Consortia met and voted to form an Ad Hoc workgroup to investigate potential alternatives to the use of the Environment Rating Scales in the element 6.

The Quality Continuous Improvement Pathways, the companion document to the Matrix, has remained unchanged throughout 2014. Consortia reported that their coaches are using the document as a guide for continuous quality improvement and professional development at the site level.

Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)

Describe progress made during the reporting year in promoting participation in the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.

In 2014, an Implementation Team liaison was assigned to each consortium to help address the challenges faced in implementing the TQRIS and promoting participation. Throughout 2014, the liaisons have established roles and responsibilities; consistent staff is dedicated to these roles, and have been meeting weekly in addition to entire Implementation Team meetings. These liaison meetings provide consistency in messaging and technical assistance to consortium in as meaningful and comprehensive means possible. The following was drafted by the liaisons and approved by the California Implementation team.

RTT-ELC Liaison Role and Responsibilities

Liaison's Purpose:

A liaison serves as representative of both Consortia members and the State Implementation team to meet federal grant responsibilities and provides essential technical assistance and support as needed.

Areas of Responsibilities:

1. Develop relationships with Key Decision-makers, Consortia Program leads/ representatives, data input staff (if different), and fiscal staff
2. Establish channels of communication
3. Approving out-of-state travel
4. Attend consortium meetings
5. Provide professional guidance, issue analysis and recommendations that are consistent with the federal grant and the Governor's direction
6. Make sure the RTT-ELC application responsibilities are not lost after decisions/recommendations
7. Facilitate workgroups, address training support/needs, as needed
8. Assist in meeting time sensitive deadlines of data collection and clarification of reports, (i.e. tables, APRs, etc.). Including ensuring that information from all sources adds up/matches
9. Ensuring that table target numbers are met or exceeded. If they were not, ensuring that there is a justification and support to follow up
10. That all communication are relayed in a timely manner, (i.e. returning phone calls, e-mails (RTT-ELC e-mail box), setting up messages for when the liaison is out, who they can refer to when the liaison is away, etc.
11. Provide regular updates of state/federal work and vice versa and provide county updates to state/federal counterparts
12. Review of consortium Action Plans (AP) and consortium Annual Performance Reports (APR)

a. Initial AP, including the budget, budget narrative, and Performance Measure Tables

b. Amendments to the AP as submitted

c. Yearly consortium APR including Performance Measure Tables

13. Review Fiscal Documents

    a. Budget and Budget Narrative

    b. Budget and Budget Narrative amendments as submitted

    c. Quarterly Expenditure Reports

    d. Ensure compliance with the Consortia Fiscal Accountability Policy (CFAP)

14. Conduct consortium On-site Validation Visits

    a. "Get Acquainted" visit

        i. Schedule and Protocol

    b. Validation visit

        a. Schedule and Protocol

15. Advocate for the consortium

16. Facilitate relationship and assist consortium members in their support of their Mentees

In August of 2014, liaisons worked together to establish a validation protocol, presented an overview of the protocol and conducted Validation visits. Since then the liaisons have been able to establish relationships with their RTT-ELC consortia to best translate their needs into webinars, presentations at the quarterly Consortia meetings, and individual consortium technical assistance.

At the local level, each consortium has continued to employ a variety of strategies to ensure measurable progress of the TQRIS participating sites. All consortia continue to focus on creating easily accessible and streamlined programs that seek to make participation a positive experience, and strive to engage and outreach to sites using trusted staff with established relationships with local providers. As State liaisons view it helpful, they facilitate the sharing and connecting of consortia regarding lessons learned. For example, El Dorado County shared their language and literacy instruction efforts through the use of their local Libraries to engage community partners in their local TQRIS. A presentation of this work was highlighted at the September 2014 Consortia meeting. Consortia heard about how Early Childhood Literacy Specialists (Library staff) engaged child care providers by asking if they would like to participate in the RTT-ELC Grant program. "As part of the RTT-ELC program, providers will receive incentives to support language rich environments in their programs. Participating providers will agree to:

- Enroll in the program.
- Complete an early care and education program self-assessment and site improvement plan with RTT-ELC staff.
- Receive instruction, mentoring and coaching in the language and literacy foundations from Library staff through two visits each month for five months."

As a result, other consortia were able to incorporate the California Preschool Learning Foundations and Curriculum Frameworks for Language and Literacy in a form that was not as intimidating as the idea of a formal training session for some family child care home providers. El Dorado consortia shared the following statements from both providers and parents:

> *I use Screenings, Assessments and Site Improvement Plans to provide high-quality early care and education services.*
>
> - a family child care provider

> *After working with High 5 for Quality (title of the El Dorado TQRIS), I am more likely to choose high quality child care.*
>
> - parent

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

In the table, provide data on the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in the State's TQRIS by type of Early Learning and Development Program. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.

Targets Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	**Baseline**		**Year 1**		**Year 2**		**Year 3**		**Year 4**	
	#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
State-funded preschool	28	0.90%	177	5.66%	436	13.94%	554	17.72%	739	23.63%
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	9	0.47%	145	7.51%	261	13.51%	409	21.17%	542	28.05%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0.00%	1	1.06%	5	5.32%	9	9.57%	9	9.57%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	6	4.26%	24	17.02%	35	24.82%	39	27.66%	65	46.10%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	19	1.09%	177	10.19%	366	21.07%	463	26.66%	668	38.46%
Other 1	18	0.11%	105	0.63%	423	2.53%	643	3.85%	1,127	6.75%
Describe:	Licensed Family Child Care Homes and Licensed Center-Based Facilities not receiving CCDF funds									

[1] *Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*

Actuals Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs									
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	3,127	28	0.90%	3,127	177	5.66%	3,127	463	14.81%
Specify:	California State Preschool Program (CSPP)								
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	1,932	9	0.47%	1,932	145	7.51%	1,932	286	14.80%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	94	-	0.00%	94	1	1.06%	94	6	6.38%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	141	6	4.26%	141	24	17.02%	141	49	34.75%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	1,737	19	1.09%	1,737	177	10.19%	1,737	312	17.96%
Other 1	16,700	18	0.11%	16,700	105	0.63%	16,700	410	2.46%
Describe:	Licensed Family Child Care Homes and Licensed Center-Based Facilities not receiving CCDF funds								

[1] *Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*

Actuals Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	3,127	818	26.20%			
Specify:	California State Preschool Program (CSPP)					
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	1,932	438	22.70%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	94	12	12.80%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	141	85	60.30%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	1,737	646	37.20%			
Other 1	16,700	907	5.40%			
Describe:	Licensed Family Child Care Homes and Licensed Center-Based Facilities not receiving CCDF funds					

[1] *Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Data Notes

Indicate if baseline data are actual or estimated; describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

Population data in this table represents the 16 Consortia counties participating in RTT-ELC. The 16 counties represent approximately 70 percent of the total sites/children in California. This table reflects duplicated programs across program types when programs received funding from more than one source.

California's targets for the number of TQRIS participating sites were developed in year one. Actual program counts are included as baseline and year one targets.

Baseline Statewide Data Sources:

State Funded Preschool: Data are collected by the California Department of Education (CDE) from the Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS) reported by Child Development Division (CDD) contractors. CDD contractors operate classrooms containing both part-day and full-day programs in blended funding programs. As of August 2011, there were 634 CDD contractors operating 3,049 State Preschool programs.

Early Head Start and Head Start data: Data are from PIR Survey Summary Report as of September 2011. There were 97 Early Head Start and 121 Head Start Programs.

IDEA Part C: California Department of Developmental Services Early Start Program for October 2011. Note that these 68 programs are not Early Learning and Development Programs that will participate in QRIS. They provide supports and specialized services to children with IFSPs and their families. California does not fund Early Learning and Development Programs with Part C funds.

IDEA Part B Section 619: CDE Special Education Division for October 2011. Note that these 117 programs are not Early Learning and Development Programs that will participate in QRIS. They provide supports and specialized services to children with IEPs. California does not fund Early Learning and Development Programs with Part B funds.

Title 1 of ESEA Data were collected from CDE. Part A data were retrieved through LEAs reporting to the Consolidated Application Data System (CADS) for the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In 2010 Program providers for children age 3 to pre-kindergarten entry include the following: 7 providers for Targeted Assistance Schools, 55 providers for Schoolwide Programs, 5 providers for Private School, and 11 providers for Neglected Program. Title I Part B data were collected from the CDE Even Start Family Literacy Program. In 2010 there were a total of 54 Projects/providers who were awarded funding through the Request For Application (RFA) process. Title 1 of ESEA Part C data were collected from the CDE Migrant, Indian, International Education Office. In 2010 there were 22 migrant regions providing services for children from birth to pre-kindergarten entry. Title 1 of ESEA Part D has no data reported for children from birth to pre-kindergarten entry age in juvenile corrections, at risk, neglected and juvenile detention programs.

Programs receiving from CCDF funds: Estimate was derived by the sum of: Assuming 20% Family Child Care Homes accepting CCDF subsidies (7,830), Total number of licensed CDD center sites (507), and 20% of universe licensed centers less CDD center sites (2,931).

Year One and Year Two Actuals Data Sources:

Participating California TQRIS Consortia Annual Performance Report (APR) Tables for Calendar Year 2013 reported January 2014.

Year Three Actuals Data Sources:

Participating California TQRIS Consortia Annual Performance Report (APR) Tables for Calendar Year 2014 reported January 2015.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established grant targets by the end of the grant period.

Consortia are proud of the progress they have made and have established momentum with their sites in developing effective strategies for coaching, quality improvement, retention, and assessment. In the coming year, they will continue these efforts and anticipate exceeding targets. They will spend the coming year supporting mentee site capacity-building and communicating regarding quality and site ratings to the public, as this is an area of identified challenge.

Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application)

Has the State made progress during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that:

System for Rating & Monitoring	
Includes information on valid and reliable tools for monitoring such programs	Yes
Has trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability	Yes
Monitors and rates Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency	Yes
Provides quality rating and licensing information to parents with children enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs (e.g., displaying quality rating information at the program site)	Yes
Makes program quality rating data, information, and licensing history (including any health and safety violations) publicly available in formats that are easy to understand and use for decision making by families selecting Early Learning and Development Programs and families whose children are enrolled in such programs	Yes

Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs by the end of the grant period.

A portion of California's grant funds are dedicated to support cross-consortia inter-rater reliability. In California's application, the high-quality plan called for the utilization of a combination of local and state oversight to best maximize expertise and resources of the local TQRIS rating and monitoring process. It includes a mechanism for guaranteeing local inter-rater reliability. As part of state-level coordination, the Inter-rater Reliability contract was executed with F5CA. The scope of work includes project management and oversight for an RTT-ELC Anchor System; development, implementation, and analysis of an Anchor System; and the planning and provision of training to RTT-ELC PSAs.

The Assessor Management System

As indicated in the previous section, the Rating and Monitoring work group updated the Implementation Guide based on Consortia feedback. This Guide accompanies the Matrix and provides a protocol necessary to achieve consistency in rating to ensure equity across the three common tiers. The protocol addresses items such as documentation, selection of classrooms for observation, and rating frequency. The Rating and Monitoring workgroup, which became the Assessor Management Workgroup, also developed a document entitled RTT-ELC Assessor Management Structure to guide agreements and local decisions around roles, responsibilities, and relationships among the State Master Anchor, local Anchors, and local assessors for the ERS and CLASS tools. This work is helping to ensure ongoing quality control through the development of ongoing reliability/calibration standards (CLASS and ERS).

The Assessor Management Structure directs State Master Anchors to:

- Certify, and annually recertify, reliability of regional ERS anchors on ERS family of tools in lieu of ERSI/authors, as needed

- Provide Observation Training to local/regional CLASS assessors and anchors on Infant, Toddler, and Pre-K CLASS Pre-K tools, as needed
- Organize ERS drift testing with regional ERS anchors
- Coordinate CLASS online calibration for regional CLASS assessors
- Provide information and support to regional ERS and CLASS anchors to carry out inter-rater reliability testing with consortia assessors

Consortia have discretion to determine required skills and experience of their local/regional anchor, such as soft skills and cultural competence, ability to assess in different types of sites and multiple years of assessment experience. Consortia may also use their local anchor to train and certify ERS assessors, coordinate local drift testing, ERS drift testingreview reports written by assessors and conduct training on ERS and CLASS (if CLASS trainer-certified).

Ongoing inter-rater reliability in all consortia was established at 85 percent for the ERS assessors, 90 percent for ERS local/regional anchors, and 80 percent for CLASS assessors using the guidelines set by the respective tools' authors. The Consortia also established the requirement for inter-rater reliability checks (online drift testing for CLASS and a one-day ERS double-code with a certified ERS Anchor) take place at least once between annual certification for each tool. F5CA arranged two calibration sessions in November and December 2014 - one for the PreK CLASS and another for the Toddler CLASS - and sent invitations to local consortia assessors and anchors through the RTT-ELC Consortia Lead Agency.

The Consortia continued to schedule and conduct training on the CLASS and ERS tools and hired or entered into contract with trained assessors to begin rating sites. In addition, per the roles and responsibilities outlined above, F5CA Anchors conducted CLASS training throughout the state to increase the number of reliable assessors on the Toddler and PreK CLASS tools. F5CA also contracted with Teachstone to provide three Infant CLASS Observer trainings in California to address the need for Infant assessors. In December 2014, F5CA Master Anchors began contacting consortia to assess additional CLASS training needs and the interest in having F5CA sponsor Teachstone to provide costly Train-the-Trainer for PreK and Toddler CLASS training so Consortia are better able to meet the needs of their CLASS assessors.

Consortia developed user-friendly assessment report formats and support materials for TQRIS participants to further ensure their understanding of the overall rating process.

The Consortia coordinated locally around the following issues:

Training and inter-rater reliability of assessors

Hiring and training of assessors and anchors occurred locally at the consortium level. The Consortia used a variety of ways to obtain assessors and most are using more than one strategy. The following are some variations in implementation:

- Hired individual consortia-specific assessors: 10/17 (59%)
- Coordinated regional assessors: 7/17 (41%)
- Shared reliable assessors across consortia, including those from other local quality initiatives and programs, such as Head Start: 6/17 (35%)
- Contracted with independent external assessors: 13/17 (76%)
- Developed a contract with other entities such as a public universities or local child care planning councils for RTT-ELC quality rating services: 4/17 (24%)

Since 2013, fewer consortia reported hiring individual raters or coordinating regional assessors and more consortia reported contracting with individual assessors. Most consortia reported using a variety of strategies (contracting, hiring, and sharing assessors) or modifying their initial strategy to assess sites with the ERS and CLASS tools. In so doing, they made considerable progress in rating sites and reaching the targeted number of rated sites in 2014. For example, Orange County's consortium report indicated:

> *Orange County's rating and monitoring system was greatly enhanced during the reporting year: An internal system was put into place to train, coordinate and manage the CLASS subcontracted raters; CLASS assessments are completed for every participating RTT-ELC classroom. In addition, a quality control system has been designed to ensure accuracy of every report released to providers. Orange County Department of Education has contracted with an experienced outside ERS consulting firm to complete ERS assessments for every participating classroom. A system was developed to hire and train a pool of subcontracted validators to validate all participating RTT-ELC pilot cohort site tiered ratings. That system includes site visits to confirm teacher/director education levels, usage of DRDP, DRDP tech, ASQ/ASQ, SE and validate reported class ratios.*

The focus in 2015 will be to increase the capacity of local Anchors to provide local training and ensure statewide inter-rater reliability.

While most consortia report increased ability to coordinate and execute quality ratings, challenges related to assessor management continued to be among the most frequently described challenges in 2014. One consortium reported being surprised at how challenging and time consuming it was to coordinate external assessors with the site's availability, which is complicated by teacher illness, assessor availability, weather, and other factors. After completing a cost analysis of assessment, several consortia were surprised at the average cost of a single assessment once they factored in costs associated with ensuring assessors achieve and maintain reliability on tools, turnover of assessors, report writing, and assessor's travel time. One consortium reported challenges in implementing the quality standards required for Rating and Monitoring, though other consortia conveyed similar sentiments; the Yolo Administrator wrote, “Although we see the benefits of establishing a standard, and our assessors appreciated the drift testing and realigning to the tools, it was costly and significantly delayed our progress on the grant.”

Overall rating processes (e.g. ongoing quality control, etc.)

Consortia-wide, programs voluntarily agree to participate in the TQRIS and are evaluated by a team of qualified assessors based on seven elements in three core areas: (1) child development and school readiness (child observations and implementation of developmental and health screenings), (2) teachers and teaching (teacher qualifications professional development and teacher-child interactions), and (3) program and environment (ratios and group size, environmental quality, and director qualifications). Participating programs receive a rating based on the assessment and a corresponding Quality Improvement (QI) Plan.

In some consortia, rating consists of an initial and post QI rating --the initial rating is used to develop an improvement plan and portfolio in preparation for the second rating (Bay Area consortia). Sites may be coached through an external coach or by their program administrator. In this way, consortia place an emphasis on the improvement activities before the rating. Ventura indicated this process of rating has led teachers to report they feel better prepared to work with the children in their care and TQRIS administrators report the observation of improved practices.

Site Monitoring

Agreements on frequency of monitoring, rating triggers, and re-rating have been made through the work of the Rating and Monitoring work group. The Consortia agreed rating will occur every other year and that 33 percent of classrooms in a site will be assessed. The Implementation Guide thoroughly details all rating and monitoring-related information, including frequency of rating and re-rating, triggers for a new rating, submission of documents and other evidence for rating, related definitions (e.g. classroom and teaching team), and classroom selection for assessment. With the finalization of the monitoring protocol, consortia recruited and hired staff to provide ongoing monitoring and quality improvement coaching. Site monitoring informs consortia of the type of training, technical assistance (TA), and support that is required for each site, including coaching and mentoring. At a local level, site monitoring may include monthly meetings with consortia staff and may include professionals such as family support and mental health consultants. Monitoring also includes the use of a database to capture rating data.

Consortia identified different databases they are using to monitor TQRIS sites and provide feedback for coaches and other TA efforts; most consortia purchased a new database for the purpose of TQRIS monitoring and have them up and running through 2014; several incorporated RTT-ELC TQRIS data into an existing non-QRIS database (Los Angeles Universal Preschool and Ventura). Consortia are discovering the amount of time and staffing it takes to maintain a reliable database and find the investment yields significant outcomes for the rating and monitoring of sites. The database, which coordinates information from other agencies such as Community Care Licensing and the resource and referral agencies, provides a system of checks and balances for assurance that only sites who meet minimum qualifications are participating in the TQRIS.

Some consortia have made great progress in using the data from the database and others still struggle with this. The Bay Area consortia indicated "the WELS data system is still not fully functional and this impacts our ability to enter and utilize QRIS data. Currently, we often have to manually manipulate data in spreadsheets to get the level of data analysis we feel we need at this point in our QRIS."

Providing quality rating and licensing information to parents enrolled in early learning programs (at the site level)

The commitment to publicizing site quality ratings to parents has begun to happen at the individual participating site level, if they so choose. Consortia are working to publicize ratings for their communities. In 2014, Fresno made ratings public via a searchable website linked to their local resource and referral agency. At the Consortia meeting in December 2014, Consortia leads participated in a panel presentation and peer sharing exercise in which they highlighted local plans to address publicizing rating information. At the state level, work on publicizing ratings will continue and the implementation team will develop a guidance document to support this work in 2015.

For example, in Ventura:

> *The Quality Committee has begun planning to make ratings public in accordance with the RTT-ELC grant application. Up to this point, sites have been given certificates with their quality rating but have had discretion on whether to post these publicly. In 2015, the Consortium will adopt procedures for making the ratings public as well as provide supporting documentation so parents and the community can understand the meaning of the ratings*.

Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application)

Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices?

Policies and Practices Supporting Program Quality	
Program and provider training	Yes
Program and provider technical assistance	Yes
Financial rewards or incentives	Yes
Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates	
Increased compensation	Yes

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
5

How many programs moved up or down at least one level within the TQRIS over the last fiscal year?

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level	103	2	39	0	1	48	72
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Has the State made progress in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS in the following areas?

High-Quality Benchmarks at the Highest Level(s) of the TQRIS	
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet State preschool standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or there is a reciprocal agreement between State preschool and the TQRIS)	Yes
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet Federal Head Start Performance Standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, there is a reciprocal agreement between Head Start and the TQRIS, or there is an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet national accreditation standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Early Learning and Development Standards	Yes
A Comprehensive Assessment System	Yes
Early Childhood Educator qualifications	Yes
Family engagement strategies	Yes
Health promotion practices	Yes
Effective data practices	Yes
Program quality assessments	Yes

Please provide more detail on your development of high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS by the end of the grant period.

The California RTT-ELC Consortia TQRIS includes three common tiers and two locally defined tiers. In sequence, California's structure is as follows:

- Tier 1 - Common (licensing)
- Tier 2 - Locally determined
- Tier 3 - Common
- Tier 4 - Common
- Tier 5 - Locally determined

As stated in California's 2013 APR, all of the consortia have five tiers and Tier 3 and above are considered high quality. Some consortia (e.g. El Dorado, the five Bay Area consortia, the two LA consortia, Orange, and San Joaquin) decided to assign local tiers at Tiers 2 and 5 to be consistent with Tier 2 and Tier 5 total point ranges on the Hybrid Rating Matrix. A few consortia (Fresno and San Diego) require programs to meet all of the elements in their local Tier 2 before they can qualify for a higher tier.

Other consortia (e.g. Fresno, Merced, Sacramento, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Yolo, and Ventura) added unique requirements or higher score requirements to their Tier 5 to address local needs and priorities including increased alignment with other initiatives. These additional requirements to obtain a Tier 5 rating include:

- Six units or 90 hours of specialized classes or training for lead teachers on working with children with special needs
- Implementation of a developmental cultural linguistic approach in lesson plans and classroom materials, provision of written development and health information in the home language of parents, and one

member of the teaching team fluent in any language that represents at least 20 percent of children in the classroom

- Overall ERS score of 6 (rather than 5.5)
- Providers are required to offer information on community-based resources including Strengthening Family protective factors related to social and emotional competence of children
- National accreditation
- Additional elements at the top tier to align with existing quality programs, including F5CA's Child Signature Program or Head Start

In 2014, the State's Implementation Team continued to assist in the development of high quality benchmarks by holding quarterly Consortia Meetings and Integrated Action Team meetings as well as by offering regional and county level trainings on the ERS and the Ages and Stages Questionnaires, and expanding the work to develop Help Me Grow. In addition to these training offerings, program and provider technical assistance was addressed by the State Implementation Team by adding two full-time consultant positions. With the addition of these two consultants, workloads were redistributed so that all consultants could complete a site visit as validation to the local work, monitor respective contracts, review quarterly expenditure reports, and to offer more technical assistance.

In 2014, the Consortia's RTT-ELC work was recognized by the state Legislature and the Governor allotted $50 million dollars annually to counties or regions following the current model of the QRIS. This funding will ensure and sustain the current work of RTT-ELC by providing QRIS block grant to State Preschool programs rated at Tiers 4 or 5. Information can be found at: http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/csppqris1415rfa.asp.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1)

In the table, provide data on the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

		Targets				Actuals			
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	**Baseline**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	49	475	1,173	1,664	2,466	475	1,042	2,232	
Number of Programs in Tier 1	14	231	146	190	115	231	177	424	
Number of Programs in Tier 2	2	50	298	371	301	50	237	639	
Number of Programs in Tier 3	26	186	514	684	940	186	349	507	
Number of Programs in Tier 4	5	6	175	310	828	6	252	592	
Number of Programs in Tier 5	2	2	32	109	282	2	27	70	

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Data Notes

Describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

Year One and Year Two Actuals Data Sources:

Participating California TQRIS Consortia Annual Performance Report (APR) Tables for Calendar Year 2013 reported January 2014.

Year Three Actuals Data Sources:

Participating California TQRIS Consortia Annual Performance Report (APR) Tables for Calendar Year 2014 reported January 2015.

These are all rated sites. There are no unrated sites.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)

In the table, provide data on the number and percentage of children with high needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

Targets Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	**Baseline**		**Year 1**		**Year 2**		**Year 3**		**Year 4**	
	#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
State-funded preschool	836	0.43%	6,409	3.27%	18,438	9.41%	21,887	11.17%	31,986	16.33%
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	208	0.13%	2,704	1.69%	11,168	6.99%	14,747	9.24%	23,320	14.61%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0.00%	8	0.18%	48	10.60%	53	1.16%	69	1.51%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	148	0.44%	924	2.76%	1,494	4.46%	1,507	4.50%	2,686	8.01%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	530	0.49%	12,033	11.16%	18,333	17.00%	20,194	18.72%	30,148	27.95%
Other 1	191	0.15%	619	0.49%	3,114	2.45%	5,979	4.70%	16,148	12.68%
Describe:	First 5 California Child Signature Program									

[1] *Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*

Actuals Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	195,909	836	0.43%	195,909	6,409	3.27%	195,909	20,357	10.39%
Specify:	California State Preschool Program (CSPP)								
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	159,664	208	0.13%	159,664	2,704	1.69%	159,664	11,564	7.24%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	4,557	0	0.00%	4,557	8	0.18%	4,557	96	2.11%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619									
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	33,521	148	0.44%	33,521	924	2.76%	33,521	778	2.32%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	107,848	530	0.49%	107,848	12,033	11.16%	107,848	12,045	11.17%
Other 1	127,322	191	0.15%	127,322	619	0.49%	127,322	6,390	5.02%
Describe:	First 5 California Child Signature Program								

[1] *Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*

Actuals Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-fundedpreschool	195,909	38,525	19.70%			
Specify:	California State Preschool Program (CSPP)					
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	159,664	21,000	13.20%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	4,557	531	11.70%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	33,521	2,877	8.60%			
Programsreceiving from CCDF funds	107,848	46,295	42.90%			
Other 1	127,332	8,014	6.30%			
Describe:	First 5 California Child Signature Program					

[1] *Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Data Notes

Please indicate whether baseline data are actual or estimated; and describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

This table reflects duplicated child counts across program types when programs received funding from more than one source.

Baseline Statewide Data Sources:

State Funded Preschool: Data are collected by the California Department of Education (CDE) from the Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS) reported by Child Development Division (CDD) contractors for April 2011.

Early Head Start and Head Start data: Data are from PIR Survey Summary Report as of September 2010. IDEA Part C: California Department of Developmental Services Early Start Program for October 2010. IDEA Part B Section 619: CDE Special Education Division for October 2010.

Titles 1 of ESEA Data were collected from CDE. Part A data were retrieved through LEAs reporting to the Consolidated Application Data System (CADS) for the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Title I Part B data were collected from the CDE Even Start Family Literacy Program. Title 1 of ESEA Part C data were collected from the CDE Migrant, Indian, International Education Office.

Programs receiving from CCDF funds: Estimate was derived by assuming 20% of children in Family Child Care Homes accepting CCDF subsidies, children enrolled in licensed CDD center sites, and 20% of children in universe licensed centers less those children in CDD center sites.

Year One and Year Two Actuals Data Sources:

Participating California TQRIS Consortia Annual Performance Report (APR) Tables for Calendar Year 2013 reported January 2014.

Year Three Actuals Data Sources:

Participating California TQRIS Consortia Annual Performance Report (APR) Tables for Calendar Year 2014 reported January 2015.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established grant targets by the end of the grant period.

Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application)

Describe progress made during the reporting year in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS during the reporting year, including the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality and assessing the extent to which changes in ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.

During Calendar Year 2014, the American Institutes for Research, research contractor to the CDE, was actively engaged in collecting and analyzing data to complete the first of two studies funded with RTT-ELC dollars. The first study, investigates the following validity and reliability elements of the TQRIS:

1. Content validity --the extent to which the quality standards used for the QRIS ratings include the key domains of quality according to empirical research and expert opinion.
2. Concurrent validity --the association between the quality rating and independent measures of quality.
3. Reliability --the extent to which the ratings and rating components exhibit sound psychometric properties and differentiate programs as expected.
4. Sensitivity --the extent to which program ratings are affected by alternative rating calculation methods.
5. QRIS implementation --documentation of how QRISs function and issues that arise during implementation or expansion.

A preliminary draft of the validity and reliability study was completed in January 2015, and is currently under review by the CDE. Study findings and recommendations will be made available to Consortia and the Federal monitoring team during the spring of 2015.

A second study on quality improvement, child outcomes, and additional system implementation findings is scheduled to be completed in June 2016.

Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)

Select the Focused Investment Areas addressed in your RTT-ELC State Plan. Grantee should complete only those sections that correspond with the focused investment areas outlined in the grantee's RTT-ELC application and State Plan.

Focused Investment Areas

☑ (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.

☐ (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.

☑ (C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.

☐ (C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.

☐ (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.

☑ (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.

☑ (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.

☐ (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)

Has the State made progress in ensuring that it's Early Learning and Development Standards:

Early Learning and Development Standards	
Are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each defined age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers	Yes
Cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness	Yes
Are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards	Yes
Are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities	Yes

Describe the progress made in the reporting year, including supports that are in place to promote the understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

To support early childhood teachers, CDE's California Early Learning and Development System provides an integrated set of resources based on state-of-the-art information for early learning and development and best practices in early education. In August 2013, the California Early Childhood Online (CECO), a RTT-ELC project, was launched with online overviews of California's Infant/Toddler Early Learning and Development Foundations and Preschool Learning Foundations, available in Spanish as well, (http://www.caearlychildhoodonline.org/). There are four modules on the Infant/Toddler Foundations and Framework and nine on the Preschool Foundations and Frameworks, with a culminating/summary module. The modules provided on the CECO Web site enable early childhood practitioners to increase content knowledge and ability to provide developmentally appropriate experiences for children in their care. CECO provides access to comprehensive resources and courses in one centralized location to meet the ever-changing needs of the early childhood field. Training module hours vary; certificates indicate completion of a domain and the amount of credit for training hours earned. In 2014, 1,030 early childhood educators completed the overview module, along with 757 infant/toddler modules and 2,166 preschool modules.

All of the Consortia reported utilizing the Continuous Quality Improvement Pathways document with the California Early Learning Foundations and Frameworks as key resources, available in both English and Spanish, used by coaches to inform site plans and professional development plans. Many also reported using the CDE Child Care and Development Fund quality improvement professional development providers: the Program for Infant/Toddler Care (PITC) to provide training on the Infant/Toddler Foundations and Framework and the California Preschool Instructional Network (CPIN) to provide training on the Preschool Foundations and Frameworks. PITC and CPIN trainers are active partners in many of the Consortia. Besides providing training on California's Foundations, PITC and CPIN also provide on-site technical assistance/coaching to designated sites to support deeper understanding of the Foundations. Merced County of Education stated that "the partnership with CPIN has been particularly instrumental in supporting efforts in a regional scale with mentee counties: Madera and Mariposa." Likewise, Sacramento County of Education "partnered with PITC to provide direct training to [its] migrant site … receiving three full-day trainings and 32 hours of coaching all delivered in

Spanish." Both of these professional development systems, PITC and CPIN, have developed training partner certification processes that have allowed them to extend their reach and build capacity within many of the consortia ensuring that more early learning providers fully understand the Foundations and Frameworks using them to inform their practice.

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

Has the State made progress in:

Child Health Promotion	
Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety	Yes
Ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur	Yes
Promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of your TQRIS Program Standards	Yes
Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported in meeting the health standards	Yes
Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity	Yes
Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets	Yes

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

The Infant/Toddler Learning and Development Foundations and the Preschool Learning Foundations (PLF) continue to be at the center of California's Early Learning and Development System. The PLF are presented to the Early Education field in three volumes. Volume 1 addresses the domains of Social-Emotional Development, Language and Literacy, English-Language Development, and Mathematics. Volume 2 of the PLF addresses the domains of Visual and Performing Arts, Physical Development and Health. Lastly, Volume 3 of the PLF covers the domains of History-Social Science and Science in the preschool setting.

The CDE has extended its work with the Foundations and Frameworks by providing local trainings throughout the state beyond those participating in RTT-ELC and began translation of the volumes into Spanish in 2014. Online modules of the Foundations and Frameworks have extended their adoption.

Professional development on health standards is accessible in a variety of ways. The Pathways, as created by the Consortia to accompany the Matrix, are foundational in the creation of Quality Improvement plans for sites participating in California's RTT-ELC and the continued work of the California TQRIS. The finalized Pathways includes the online Preschool Health Foundations and Framework training modules available on the California Early Childhood Online (CECO) Web site. The CECO Web site, newly launched in 2013, is now well attended and visited even by those not participating in RTT-ELC.

Health, including screening, continues to be strongly incorporated into the TQRIS through both the Rating Matrix's element 2 and the Pathways.

In 2013, California RTT-ELC provided funding for toolkits and for Consortia members in all 16 counties to attend train-the-trainer sessions on the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and ASQ-Social Emotional screening tools. In 2014, the CDE EESD extended its contract to provide continued support beyond the ASQ work initiated in 2013. The 2014 developmental screening work began with conducting consortium visits to create individualized county TA plans. Additional ASQ train-the-trainer sessions were conducted, more importantly, TA on connecting screening results to making appropriate referrals. The use of screening results to improve services and supports

to staff and children served within the RTT-ELC participating sites is a focus of the contract and connecting to the work of the California Statewide Screening Collaborative (CSSC).

The CSSC brings together state, local, public, and private entities that focus on California's capacity to promote and deliver effective and well-coordinated health, developmental and behavioral screenings for young children, birth to age 5. The goal is to enhance state capacity to promote and deliver effective and well-coordinated health, developmental and behavioral screenings throughout California.

California's RTT-ELC Implementation Team members attend quarterly meetings. The CSSC goals are focused on:

1. Improving coordination among state agencies and programs involved in early identification, recognition and response activities to support the development of young children.
2. Promoting the use of standardized screening tools, effective screening protocols, and increased communication among agencies and services.
3. Identifying screening resources, funding and follow-up supports that promote healthy early childhood development, school readiness, positive parent-child relationships, and access to services.

Among key activities of the CSSC for 2014:

- Developed an Early Care and Education (ECE) Provider Screening Toolkit. Based on the work of the federal Birth to Five: Watch Me Thrive! screening initiative, the ECE Provider Screening Toolkit will be released for dissemination in early 2015. Technical assistance is being offered to interested RTT-ELC Regional Consortia to develop local screening pathways and referrals through use of the Toolkit.
- Launched a survey via the CSSC to learn about local screening services and related referral and data collection activities. These data will inform the characteristics of developmental and behavioral screening services throughout the state, particularly who is delivering screening and in what types of settings. A full report and data analysis will be available at the January 2015 CSSC meeting.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

In the table, provide data on leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable statewide targets. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.

Targets					
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Number of Children with High Needs screened	126,184	128,707	230,000	234,600	239,292
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	43,433	44,201	48,621	49,593	50,584
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	1,149,408	1,157,902	1,175,270	1,187,022	1,198,892
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	93.2%	93.5%	94.0%	94.5%	95.0%

Actuals				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Number of Children with High Needs screened	126,184	157,008	186,429	
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	43,433	87,836	88,713	
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	1,149,408	1,149,408	1,149,408	
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	93.2%	93.2%	94.9%	

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Data Notes

Indicate if baseline data are actual or estimated; describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

Year 3 data included for "Number of Children with High Needs screened" and "Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow up/treatment" are actual child counts, as reported by California's TQRIS Consortia for Calendar Year 2014, Head Start/Early Head Start for FY 2013/14, First 5

California Child Signature Program for July 2014, and the Department of Developmental Services Early Start Program for 2014.

Data included for "Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care" is an estimated count based on currently insured children ages 0 to 5 under 200% of the Federal Poverty Level who received two or more doctor visits in the previous year from the 2009 California Health Interview Survey. These data were not included for the CHIS 2011 or 2013/14 survey.

Data included for the count "Of these participating children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care" are estimated counts of currently insured children ages 0 to 5 under 200% of the Federal Poverty Level" from the 2011/12 California Health Interview Survey. These data were not included for the CHIS 2013/14 survey.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

Some Consortia are able to collect and report screening and referral data to the state implementation team, and some are not. California does not have one single data system for programs and providers to track and report this information. For the purposes of federal reporting, Consortia data are included, as are screening counts and/or referral estimates provided to children in all Head Start sites and Child Signature Program classrooms. Upon reflection of performance targets identified in California's original application, identified screening counts were overly ambitious given the status of screening systems in California while referral counts were underestimated based on information available at the time.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application)

Has the State made progress in developing:

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework	
A common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes	Yes
A common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework	Yes

Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including progress in engaging postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

As stated in the 2013 California APR, building systems for California's dynamic early childhood workforce takes time. The quality improvement efforts included in this report highlight activities and accomplishments in California's implementation of RTT-ELC in 2014 and are a snapshot describing the individual efforts and accomplishments from the Consortia. Significant investments have been made to support workforce at the local level. Some are short-term (a year or less) and some changes were made incrementally and will take place over a period of years. Because of California's unique design, our 2014 update to California's workforce development will be described at both the state and local level, starting with an update to California's Workforce Competencies and Early Learning and Development System and closing with the specific activities provided through the 17 consortia.

Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application)

Has the State made progress in improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs with the goal of improving child outcomes:

Supporting Early Childhood Educators	
Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework	Yes
Implementing policies and incentives that promote professional and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention, including:	Yes
Scholarships	Yes
Compensation and wage supplements	Yes
Tiered reimbursement rates	Yes
Other financial incentives	Yes
Management opportunities	Yes
Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention	Yes
Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for:	Yes
Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework	Yes
Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework	Yes

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Workforce Competency Framework

An essential statewide element aimed at supporting a strong workforce is the California Early Childhood Educator Competencies (Competencies), located at: http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/ececomps.asp. California's robust Competencies (initiated in 2008 and completed in 2011) are aligned with the California Preschool Learning Foundations and the California Infant/Toddler Learning and Development Foundations and guide professional development and related quality improvement activities. The Competencies serve four interrelated purposes: 1) provide structure for workforce development, 2) inform Higher Education course of study, 3) guide credentialing efforts, and 4) define educator skills, knowledge and dispositions.

The following projects were developed based on the Competencies to address various workforce needs:

The Competencies Integration Project (CIP), a State Advisory Council (SAC) for Early Learning project, created a rubric for mapping the Competencies to course work and professional development (PD) training activities.

Because of the breadth of these competencies, the CIP also created a web-based Mapping Tool to assist faculty and PD providers in mapping their learning objectives to specific competencies.

As stated in 2013 California APR, the California Competencies Mapping Tool became operational. Forty two community colleges, 11 California State Universities and 19 ECE professional development organizations have utilized the tool. From 2013 to December of 2014, there has been an increase of 292 mapped courses which brings the total number of mapped courses to 491! Likewise, from 2013-2014, there has been an increase of 44 trainings that have been mapped with the Competencies via the web-based Mapping Tool which brings the total number of mapped trainings to 63. The aforementioned data, as well as data gathered by the attendees of webinars, provided by child development higher education faculty from California Community Colleges and State Universities, and state-funded Professional Development Providers demonstrates significant growth in the usage of the mapping tool. Information can be found at: http://www.childdevelopment.org/cs/cip/print/htdocs/cip/home.htm.

California's workforce development also included supporting the CCDF-funded California Community Colleges Curriculum Alignment Project (CAP) and CAP Expansion. The CAP engaged faculty from across the state to develop a 24 unit lower-division program of study supporting early care and education teacher preparation. These eight courses represent evidence-based courses that are intended to become a foundational core for all early care and education professionals and have been approved for a BA transfer degree.

In 2012, additional funding was provided by the grant to expand the project to include seven additional courses in the three specialization areas of Infant/Toddler, Administration, and Children with Special Needs. The seven courses include the following:

1. Infant/Toddler Development
2. Infant/Toddler Care and Education
3. Introduction to Young Children with Special Needs
4. Curriculum and Strategies for children with special Needs
5. Administration I: Programs in ECE
6. Administration II: Leadership and Supervision
7. Adult Supervision and Mentoring

In 2014, 101 Community Colleges in California have agreed to participate in CAP. Of these colleges, 84 are officially aligned, and 1 is provisionally aligned pending official documents, 5 others are in the revision process to align their course. The CDE does not track the data presented, however, further information can be found at: https://www.childdevelopment.org/cs/cdtc/print/htdocs/services_cap.htm

The Early Childhood Educator Competencies Self-Assessment Toolkit (ECE CompSAT) was another project created to be a professional development self-reflection resource for the early childhood education workforce. The ECE CompSAT came online in February 2014, and has assisted RTT-ELC site leaders and coaches with the development of professional growth plans by identifying the competencies needed for effective, high-quality early education practice. Several consortia have included utilization of the ECE CompSAT into their action plans as a way to focus on the priority of local workforce needs. Through the CDE's Curriculum Alignment Project (CAP), the California Community College representatives, in collaboration with the EESD, developed the “Early Childhood/Child Development Lower Division 8" as a shared and essential portion of a lower division program of study. The RTT-ELC expansion of early learning core curricula at California Community Colleges has progressed.

As reported in the 2013 California APR, community college faculty expanded the initial CAP agreement to include a uniform set of common course outlines in the areas of Administration, Children with Special Needs, and Infant/Toddlers. A survey was conducted to further understand faculty interest and capture course uniformity in 103 colleges, offering the selected courses of study. As of 2014, 101 Community Colleges in California have agreed to participate in CAP. Of these colleges, 84 are officially aligned, and one is provisionally aligned pending official documents, five others are in the revision process to align their course work. CAP courses have recently been accepted as the required core for the Associate in Science for Transfer in Early Childhood Education. Alignment will continue through 2015. The CDE does not track the data presented, however, information can be found at:
http://www.childdevelopment.org/cs/cdtc/print/htdocs/services_cap.htm.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1)

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

		Targets				Actuals			
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	31	51	102	102	102	31	51	102	
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	19,916	20,314	20,721	21,135	21,558	19,916	20,943	22,501	

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) Data Notes

Data source: Child Development Training Consortium (CDTC) - Permit report 2013-14 and Curriculum Alignment Project (CAP) aligned CA Community Colleges.

Since the valid credentials are for five years, the total number of First-time (New) and upgraded permits for the most recent five years are added together subtracting the renewals and downgraded numbers for the job categories Assistant, Associate Teacher, Teacher, Master Teacher, Site Supervisor, and Program Director.

Have met/exceeded our targets for the year in both number of "aligned"

Institutions and providers and number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

Have met/exceeded our targets for the year in both number of "aligned" Institutions and providers and number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2)

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Targets										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	*Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year*									
Progression: Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Assistant (Lowest)	4,372	2.0%	4,459	3.0%	4,549	3.0%	4,640	3.0%	4,732	3.0%
Child Development Associate Teacher	6,237	4.0%	6,362	4.0%	6,489	4.0%	6,619	4.0%	6,751	4.0%
Child Development Teacher	3,782	2.0%	3,858	2.0%	3,935	2.0%	4,013	2.0%	4,094	2.0%
Child Development Master Teacher	999	1.0%	1,019	1.0%	1,039	1.0%	1,060	1.0%	1,081	1.0%
Child Development Site Supervisor	3,501	2.0%	3,571	2.0%	3,642	2.0%	3,715	2.0%	3,790	2.0%
Child Development Program Director (Highest)	1,025	1.0%	1,046	1.0%	1,066	1.0%	1,088	1.0%	1,109	1.0%

Actuals										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	*Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year*									
Progression: Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Assistant (Lowest)	4,372	2.0%	4,732	3.0%	4,938	3.0%	4,721	3.0%		
Child Development Associate Teacher	6,237	4.0%	7,340	4.0%	7,490	4.0%	7,349	4.0%		
Child Development Teacher	3,782	2.0%	4,442	2.0%	5,117	3.0%	5,691	3.0%		
Child Development Master Teacher	999	1.0%	978	1.0%	1,098	1.0%	1,098	1.0%		
Child Development Site Supervisor	3,501	2.0%	2,916	2.0%	3,261	2.0%	2,298	1.0%		
Child Development Program Director (Highest)	1,025	1.0%	535	1.0%	597	0.0%	165	0.0%		

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Data Notes

Please describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information.

Data source: Child Development Training Consortium- Permit report 2013-14.

As to a California Early Education Workforce study by University of California Berkley, the estimated total number of early education workforce is 176,000. The percentages for each credential type for each year is based on the estimated total workforce 176,000.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

The state has met/exceeded our targets for the year in credential types for Child Development Assistant, Child Development Associate Teacher, Child Development Teacher and Child Development Master Teacher. CA has lower than the target numbers for credential types Child Development Site Supervisor and Child Development Program Director. Please note that there was a lower number of applications for Child Development Program Director permits due to funding limitations.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)

Has the State made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that:

Kindergarten Entry Assessment	
Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness	Yes
Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities	Yes
Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the third year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten (e.g., the 2014-2015 school year for Round 1 grantee states, the 2015-2016 school year for Round 2 grantees). States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation	Yes
Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws	Yes
Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA)	Yes

Describe the domain coverage of the State's Kindergarten Entry Assessment, validity and reliability efforts regarding the Kindergarten Entry Assessment, and timing of the administration of the Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

The CDE has developed the Desired Results Developmental Profile-School Readiness (DRDP-SR) as a Kindergarten Entry Assessment. The DRDP-SR currently includes the domains of language and literacy development, cognition and general knowledge (including early mathematics and early scientific development), approaches toward learning (including self-regulation), social and emotional development, and English language development. Validity and reliability testing has been completed and a calibration study of the DRDP-SR was completed in 2013.

The CDE and its assessment partners, WestEd and UC Berkeley Evaluation, Assessment, and Research (BEAR) Center, have further developed the DRDP-SR in collaboration with the State of Illinois. This includes the expansion of the instrument to include the domains of physical well-being and motor development (including adaptive skills), History-Social Science, Visual and Performing Arts, and Language and Literacy Development in Spanish. The instrument has also been expanded with later levels of development so the assessment is appropriate for use through the entire kindergarten year. To identify the expanded kindergarten entry assessment the instrument has been named the Desired Results Developmental Profile - Kindergarten (2015) (DRDP-K (2015)). It has been be field tested and is being calibrated in the 2014 - 15 academic year. The DRDP-K (2015) with all domains will go into use in fall 2015.

Preliminary validity and reliability studies for DRDP-K took place in 2014, and final calibration activities commenced. Additionally, the CDE collaborated with its assessment partners (UC Berkeley and WestEd) on the

design of additional validity and reliability research studies to begin in 2015. Studies for the DRDP-K that will commence in 2015 include rater certification, inter-rater reliability, criterion zone setting (cut score), and equating studies linking the current version of the DRDP-K assessment to DRDP assessments for preschool, thereby helping to build connections between early education and K-12 communities.

Each of the Consortia is working with districts in their counties to support training and utilization of the DRDP-SR or DRDP-K within the first two months of starting Transitional Kindergarten (TK) or traditional Kindergarten (K).

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Adoption of the DRDP-SR or DRDP-K continues to be mixed, primarily because use of this tool is voluntary. One consortium provides incentives to districts to use the DRDP-SR/K; two held meetings with local educational agencies; another two held training events on the instrument; and several have sent or provided information about the instrument to local districts. Two are using a different kindergarten entry assessment. Several consortium state that their current focus is on rating early learning programs, limiting their outreach efforts to districts.

Currently, the Santa Clara QRIS is not providing direct funding to support the implementation of the DRDP-SR/K instruments because they are being reviewed by our local school districts that are determining if they can pilot them. Their QRIS is waiting until local school districts can provide specific strategies on how their efforts can be supported. Santa Clara County Office of Education is participating in their consortium and keeping them informed on school districts progress in adopting these tools. Grants from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and the Silicon Valley Community Foundation are providing planning and implementation grants to support the use of these tools in their county. The Silicon County Community Foundation in supporting a pilot in Santa Clara County on the new DRDP-K assessment tool at: Franklin McKinley School District, Orchard School District, Berryessa School District and Mount Pleasant School District. Through this pilot the school districts receive training on how to conduct the assessment and provide follow up trainings after the assessments are complete. Technical assistance is provided through a Transitional Kindergarten Specialist based at the Santa Clara County Office of Education. Campbell Unified School District is utilizing the DRDP-SR and several other school districts are developing plans to pilot this instrument. Efforts are still underway to identify funding support to help provide the training and technical assistance needed to utilize these instruments. The length and time needed to accurately complete these assessments has been reported as a significant challenge by their school districts.

In 2014, the CDE redirected RTT-ELC resources to UC BEAR specifically to support the implementation of the DRDP-K. UC Berkeley consultants supported current and potential DRDP-K users by providing written materials, phone support, and in-person visits and presentations about the purposes, benefits and challenges of the DRDP-K. For example, consultants presented in-person information sessions to teachers and administrators from multiple counties on the development of the DRDP-K, and facilitated sessions on district and classroom level data use using current student data.

UC Berkeley consultants worked to expand adoption of the DRDP-K through multiple strategies including: (1) email and phone call outreach to potential users of the DRDP-K; (2) building communities of practice by helping to connecting districts who are using the DRDP-SR and DRDP-K; (3) building partnerships with cross-sector stakeholders, including state and local education agencies, state-level advocacy groups, foundations, and other non-profits. For example, UC Berkeley consultants met multiple times with representatives from Children Now,

the First 5 Association, Silicon Valley Community Foundation, WestEd and local education agencies to discuss DRDP-K data use for RTT-ELC Consortia members and other districts. Consultants also solicited input from districts on the design of a new DRDP-K report card for families, and applied this information to create a beta version of the report card for DRDPtech.

In 2014, the DRDP-SR and the DRDP-K were used by 285 teachers, with 5,048 students in 41 local education agencies. Though still modest compared to California's Kindergarten population, this represents almost a tripling of TK & K students assessed using the DRDP-SR or DRDP-K.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development

In the tables that follow, provide updated data on the State's commitment to early learning and development as demonstrated in Section A(1) of the State's RTT-ELC application. Tables A(1) -1 through 3 should be updated with current data. Tables 4 and 5 should provide data for the reporting year as well as previous years of the grant. Tables 6 and 7 may be updated only where significant changes have occurred (if no changes have occurred, you should note that fact).

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income[1] families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	**Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State**
Infants under age 1	274,036	54.5%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	543,576	54.5%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	815,935	54.5%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	1,633,546	54.5%
[1] Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.		

Data Table (A)(1)-1 Data Notes

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, State and County Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Age 2010-2060, Sacramento, California, January 2015.

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs		
Special Populations: Children who…	**Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who…**	**Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who…**
Have disabilities or developmental delays[1]	50,511	2.0%
Are English learners[2]	912,838	37.0%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	4,273	0.2%
Are migrant[3]	13,213	0.9%
Are homeless[4]	131,578	4.0%
Are in foster care	18,702	0.7%
Other as identified by the State	975,220	39.0%
Describe:	At risk of developmental delay	

[1]For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).
[2]For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English.
[3]For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2).
[4]The term "homeless children" has the meaning given the term "homeless children and youths" in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).

Data Table (A)(1)-2 Data Notes

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Have Disability or Developmental Delay: Data was obtained from DataQuest, the California Department of Education (CDE) Reporting System on 1/16/15. "Special education enrollment by age and disability" data obtained for December 2013. Percentage was obtained by dividing the number of children, ages 0-4 enrolled in special education by the total number of California children ages 0-4 population estimate from the 2013 American Community Survey.

English Learners: (CDE) English language learners is an estimate based upon the percentage of kindergartners that are designated as English Language Learners upon school entry (37%). This percentage was obtained from DataQuest, the CDE Reporting System on 1/16/15. Data for "Statewide English Learners by language by grade" and "Statewide enrollment by grade" for 2013-14 was used to calculate the percentage of kindergartners that were designated English Language Learners. The total number of 0-4 year old California children was multiplied by .37 to obtain the estimated number of English learners.

Reside on Indian Lands: This estimate used the 2010 Census summary File 1 Table PCT12 and include children 0-4 of American Indian Areas/Alaska Native Areas in California. Tabulations were done by the California Department of Finance State Census Data Center.

Migrant: This estimate used the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 5 who, within three years of making a qualifying move, resided in a state one or more days, between September 1

and August 31 of reporting period 2012-13 as collected by the CDE through the LEA reporting to the Consolidated Application Data System for the Consolidated State Performance Report.

Homeless: This estimate used the total unduplicated statewide number of homeless students who were enrolled in public schools in local education agencies (LEAs) as collected by the CDE through the LEA reporting to the Consolidated Application Data System for the 2012-13 Consolidated State Performance Report. This number was multiplied by 42% to calculate the estimated number of homeless children age 0-5. As noted in the National Center on Family Homelessness report "California: American's Youngest Outcasts: State Report Card on Child Homelessness". The estimate is based on research that 42% of homeless children are ages 0 -5. For more information, see Burt, M. et al. (1999). Homelessness: Programs and the People They Serve. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/. Percentage obtained by dividing the estimated number of homeless children age 0-5 by the total number of children age 0-5 in California pulled from http://www.kidsdata.org/.

In Foster Care: Data obtained from University of California at Berkeley's Center for Social Services Research. Children ages 0 to 4 "Number in Care". Obtained on 1/16/15.

At Risk of Development Delay: Data obtained by analyzing data from the 2009 California Health Interview Survey as of 1/16/15. To obtain the estimated percentage (.39), "Risk of Developmental Delay" was collapsed into two levels – Moderate to High Risk and Low to No Risk for California children ages 0-4 http://www.chis.ucla.edu/. To obtain the estimated number of children at risk of developmental delay the total CA population age 0-4 was multiplied by the estimated percentage (.39).

Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age

Note: A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	**Infants under age 1**	**Toddlers ages 1 through 2**	**Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry**	**Total**
State-funded preschool	-	-	136,718	136,718
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:	CDE Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS) for April 2014			
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	4,968	15,790	98,889	119,647
Data Source and Year:	Head Start Program Information Report Enrollment Statistics Report for 2013-2014.			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	3,422	49,169	53,944	106,535
Data Source and Year:	IDEA Part C: California Department of Developmental Services Early Start Program for Calendar Year 2012.			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	5,934	23,791	29,725
Data Source and Year:	CDE Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for School Year 13-14.			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	5,551	30,341	65,773	101,665
Data Source and Year:	CDE Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS) for April 2014			
[1] *Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*				

Data Table (A)(1)-3a Data Notes

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Sources:

State Funded Preschool: California Department of Education (CDE) Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS) for April 2014

Early Head Start and Head Start data: Head Start Program Information Report Enrollment Statistics Report for 2013-2014.

IDEA Part C: California Department of Developmental Services Early Start Program for Calendar Year 2014.

IDEA Part B Section 619: CDE Special Education Division for December 2013.

Title 1 of ESEA: CDE Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for School Year 13-14.

Programs receiving CCDF funds: CDE CDMIS for October 2014.

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	**Hispanic Children**	**Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children**	**Non-Hispanic Asian Children**	**Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children**	**Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children**	**Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races**	**Non-Hispanic White Children**
State-funded preschool	94,655	840	8,078	10,317	655		18,330
Specify:	Full day and Part day						
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]							
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C							
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619							
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	100,164	651	7,491	34,373	832		30,293
[1] Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.							

Data Table (A)(1)-3b Data Notes

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Sources:

State Funded Preschool: California Department of Education (CDE) Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS) for October 2014.

Early Head Start and Head Start data: Head Start Program Information Report Enrollment Statistics Report for 2013-2014.

Programs receiving CCDF funds: CDE CDMIS for October 2014.

1 Head Start Program Information Report states Ethnicity and Race separately.
Ethnicity- Hispanic or Latino origin - 90,283, Non-Hispanic/Non - Latino origin 31,059

Race - American Indian/Alaska Native -7,754. Asian-5,346. Black or African American 11,529. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 619. White 61,144. Biracial or Multi-Racial 5,546. Other Race -21,842 and Unspecified Race 7,562 (These Ethnicity and Race numbers include 1,695 Pregnant Women)

Race/ethnicity data for funding sources types other than California State Preschool Program and CCDF is not available at a statewide level.

Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development

Note: For States that have a biennial State budget, please complete for all fiscal years for which State funds have been appropriated. We are not asking for forecasting, but for actual allocations. Therefore, States that do not have biennial budgets need not complete for years for which appropriations do not yet exist.

Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	**Baseline**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start[1]					
State-funded preschool	$373,695,000	$481,003,000	$506,965,000	$654,450,000	
Specify:	State General Fund				
State contributions to IDEA, Part C	$72,427,000	$73,237,000	$74,753,000	$75,933,000	
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry					
Total State contributions to CCDF[2]	$1,428,156,000	$1,231,606,000	$1,249,409,000	$1,486,685,000	
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	-
If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded	$756,878,774	$454,222,878	v445,790,451	v537,343,379	
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs[3]	$408,563,000	$364,998,000	$377,484,000	$348,550,000	
Other State contributions 1	$17,259,034	$17,716,003	$21,589,912	$28,176,818	
Specify:	F5CA Child Signature Program				
Total State contributions:	**$1,926,405,034**	**$1,687,557,003**	**$1,723,235,912**	**$1,939,344,818**	

[1] Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.
[2] Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.
[3] Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

Data Table (A)(1)-4 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data, including the State's fiscal year end date.

This data reflects the State Fiscal Year (SFY) beginning July 1 and ending June 30 of each SFY.

The sections related to State-funded preschool, Total State contributions to CCDF, and State match to CCDF reflect state general fund appropriated for the Child Care and Development Program for that SFY.

Total state contributions to CCDF include all state general fund allocated to the California Department of Education (CDE) including the amounts provided in the State-funded preschool fields and the amounts allocated for Quality Improvement projects.

State match to CCDF reflects the state general fund allocated to the CDE for the Child Care and Development Program, except for the amounts provided in the State-funded preschool fields that were not used for either maintenance of effort or match. Some of the excess is used by the California Department of Social Services for TANF match.

Total State contributions is the sum of State contributions to IDEA Part C, Total State contributions to CCDF, TANF spending on Early Learning and Development, and Child Signature Program.

Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs. However, the current year should match the program totals reported in Table (A)(1)-3a.

Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program[1]					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Baseline**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**
State-funded preschool *(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)*	101,414	149,361	134,853	136,718	
Specify:					
Early Head Start and Head Start[2] *(funded enrollment)*	121,506	122,558	133,718	119,647	
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 *(annual December 1 count)*	80,226	80,428	103,636	106,535	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA *(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)*	26,580	24,860	19,174	29,725	
Programs receiving CCDF funds *(average monthly served)*	125,899	102,610	98,906	101,665	

[1] *Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.*
[2] *Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.*

Data Table (A)(1)-5 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed. Include current year if data are available.

Sources:

State Funded Preschool: California Department of Education (CDE) Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS) for April 2014.

Early Head Start and Head Start data: Head Start Program Information Report Enrollment Statistics Report for 2013-2014.

IDEA Part C: California Department of Developmental Services Early Start Program for Calendar Year 2014.

IDEA Part B Section 619: CDE Special Education Division for December 2013.

Title 1 of ESEA: CDE Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for School Year 13-14.

Programs receiving CCDF funds: CDE CDMIS for October 2014.

According to Consolidated state Performance Report Part 1 and 11 these was an emphasis on outreach to preschool-age homeless children and California Department of Education has seen an increase in the 3-5 year olds as a result. On the other hand some of the data could be duplicated since data collected via a survey that does not include a unique statewide identifier for this age group.

As to the California Head Start Association the drop in EHS/HS numbers were partially due to sequester.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards

Check marks indicate the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards			
Essential Domains of School Readiness	**Age Groups**		
	Infants	**Toddlers**	**Preschoolers**
Language and literacy development	✓	✓	✓
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)	✓	✓	✓
Approaches toward learning	✓	✓	✓
Physical well-being and motor development	✓	✓	✓
Social and emotional development	✓	✓	✓

Data Table (A)(1)-6 Data Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State

Check marks indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State					
Types of programs or systems	**Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System**				
	Screening Measures	**Formative Assessments**	**Measures of Environmental Quality**	**Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions**	**Other**
State-funded preschool		✓	✓	✓	
Specify:					
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	✓	✓		✓	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	✓	✓		✓	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA		✓	✓		
Programs receiving CCDF funds		✓	✓	✓	
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier) **Tier 1**	✓				
Tier 2	✓	✓	✓		
Tier 3	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tier 4	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tier 5	✓	✓	✓	✓	
State licensing requirements	✓				
Other 1	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Describe:	First 5 California Child Signature Program				

[1] *Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*

Data Table (A)(1)-7 Data Notes

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data, if necessary.

Budget and Expenditure Tables

Budget and Expenditure Table 1: Overall Budget and Expenditure Summary by Budget Category

Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous budget period and for the current reporting period.

Budget Summary Table

Budget Summary Table					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$34,797.05	$83,673.08	$194,875.54	$0.00	**$313,345.67**
2. Fringe Benefits	$591.97	$7,122.95	$41,426.47	$0.00	**$49,141.39**
3. Travel	$0.00	$1,755.92	$9,043.44	$0.00	**$10,799.36**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$53.59	$0.00	**$53.59**
6. Contractual	$2,323,748.89	$3,901,660.38	$6,722,491.58	$0.00	**$12,947,900.85**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$296,621.81	$85,592.97	$0.00	**$382,214.78**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$2,359,137.91	$4,290,834.14	$7,053,483.59	$0.00	**$13,703,455.64**
10. Indirect Costs	$134,222.82	$281,050.33	$244,000.61	$0.00	**$659,273.76**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$9,850,000.00	$10,150,000.00	$26,024,702.50	$0.00	**$46,024,702.50**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$11,598.57	$40,580.58	$70,439.67	$0.00	**$122,618.82**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$12,354,959.30	$14,762,465.05	$33,392,626.37	$0.00	**$60,510,050.72**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$12,354,959.30**	**$14,762,465.05**	**$33,392,626.37**	**$0.00**	**$60,510,050.72**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Budget Summary Table Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

There are changes to six of the projects. The three new positions in Project 1 - Grants Management were filled last year. The actual cost of the positions was less than anticipated. This resulted in savings in Personnel, Fringe Benefits, Other and Indirect Costs. The contract in Project 13 for Inter-Rater Reliability was a lower amount than originally thought. Also, there has been a change in the policy for charging indirect costs and only the first $250,000 rather than the first $500,000 is subject to indirect cost charges. This impacted the Inter-Rater Reliability contract and resulted in some additional savings. All savings was directed to Project 2- Regional Leadership Consortia, Expansion and Related Activities to provide support for the Consortia. Other changes are related to moving unspent balances to future years and updating rates.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Any unspent funds that become available may be used to contract for communications/marketing for California's QRIS, to add an additional component to the evaluation, or for incentives for KEA adoption.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Grants Management

Budget Table: Project 1					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$34,797.05	$64,051.68	$188,847.25	$0.00	**$287,695.98**
2. Fringe Benefits	$591.97	$979.34	$39,536.87	$0.00	**$41,108.18**
3. Travel	$0.00	$1,755.92	$9,043.44	$0.00	**$10,799.36**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$53.59	$0.00	**$53.59**
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$5,921.00	$0.00	**$5,921.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$4,985.49	$29,730.47	$0.00	**$34,715.96**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$35,389.02	$71,772.43	$273,132.62	$0.00	**$380,294.07**
10. Indirect Costs	$14,822.11	$11,819.06	$88,388.93	$0.00	**$115,030.10**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$11,598.57	$40,580.58	$70,439.67	$0.00	**$122,618.82**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$61,809.70	$124,172.07	$431,961.22	$0.00	**$617,942.99**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$61,809.70**	**$124,172.07**	**$431,961.22**	**$0.00**	**$617,942.99**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 1 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

The Personnel line item was adjusted to reflect the actual salary amount for the year for the three new staff hired. This also impacts the Fringe Benefits and Other categories. Of the funds budgeted for travel, $5,921 has been moved to the Contractual line item to provide funding to First 5 California (F5CA) staff for travel costs. $40,518 of the technical assistance funds has also been allocated for F5CA travel. To date, the remainder of the technical assistance funds have been used mainly for out-of-state travel for the California Department of Education (CDE) staff. The balances remaining for Supplies and Equipment have been moved forward to be utilized in Grant Year 4.The indirect cost charges are based on actual expenditures so there is a corresponding change to those costs due to the items mentioned above.

Project 1 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

The three new positions are scheduled to end 12/31/15. We are hoping to extend those positions and have set aside funding for this purpose. The savings resulting from the changes to Project 1 have been moved to Project 2 to provide funding to support the Consortia.

Budget Table: Project 2 – Regional Leadership Consortia, Expansion and Related Activities

Budget Table: Project 2					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$264,801.53	$0.00	**$264,801.53**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$0.00	$264,801.53	$0.00	**$264,801.53**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$9,850,000.00	$10,150,000.00	$26,024,702.50	$0.00	**$46,024,702.50**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$9,850,000.	$10,150,000.	$26,289,504.03	$0.00	**$46,289,504.03**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$9,850,000.00**	**$10,150,000.00**	**$26,289,504.03**	**$0.00**	**$46,289,504.03**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 2 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

The savings from other projects was directed to Project 2 to provide funding to support the Consortia. The California Early Care and Education (ECE) Workforce Registry is currently funded by private and local funds for San Francisco and Los Angeles counties. This project has been increased by $264,801.53 to provide additional support for the 14 RTT-ELC Consortia counties joining the ECE Workforce Registry. The Child Development Training Consortium staff will provide procedures and instructions to the more than 3,000 participants in the 14 Consortia counties. This includes providing transcript review assistance and working with the ECE Workforce Registry to secure transcript module development; valid participant and work experience profiles as well as alignment data sets. These activities will enhance the quality and professionalism of the ECE workforce within the Consortia membership.

Project 2 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

As other projects are concluded, unspent funds may be directed to provide additional funding for this project.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Home Visiting

Budget Table: Project 3					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$440,000.00	$250,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$690,000.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$440,000.00	$250,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$690,000.00**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$440,000.00	$250,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$690,000.00**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$440,000.00**	**$250,000.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$690,000.00**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 3 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

No change.

Project 3 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

No change.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Screening Tool Distribution

Budget Table: Project 4					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$28,358.76	$0.00	$254,999.90	$0.00	**$283,358.66**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$291,636.32	$55,862.50	$0.00	**$347,498.82**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$28,358.76	$291,636.32	$310,862.40	$0.00	**$630,857.48**
10. Indirect Costs	$5,955.35	$61,243.63	$72,028.68	$0.00	**$139,227.66**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$34,314.11	$352,879.95	$382,891.08	$0.00	**$770,085.14**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$34,314.11**	**$352,879.95**	**$382,891.08**	**$0.00**	**$770,085.14**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 4 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

The funds in the “Other” category are used to purchase Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) kits and packets. The state received a discount on this purchase resulting in some savings..

Project 4 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

The balance of $4,137.50 along with the associated fixed costs will be moved to Grant Year 4 to purchase additional ASQ kits and packets.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Curricula Development for Higher Education

Budget Table: Project 5					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$170,000.00	$224,542.00	$226,840.00	$0.00	**$621,382.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$170,000.00	$224,542.00	$226,840.00	$0.00	**$621,382.00**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$170,000.00	$224,542.00	$226,840.00	$0.00	**$621,382.00**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$170,000.00**	**$224,542.00**	**$226,840.00**	**$0.00**	**$621,382.00**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 5 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

No change.

Project 5 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

No change.

Budget Table: Project 6 – CSEFEL

Budget Table: Project 6					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$835,458.13	$994,101.87	$939,504.00	$0.00	**$2,769,064.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$835,458.13	$994,101.87	$939,504.00	$0.00	**$2,769,064.00**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$835,458.13	$994,101.87	$939,504.00	$0.00	**$2,769,064.00**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$835,458.13**	**$994,101.87**	**$939,504.00**	**$0.00**	**$2,769,064.00**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 6 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

While there is no change to the total amount allocated for CSEFEL, the amounts for each year were changed to reflect the encumbered amounts. $54,592.87 was moved from Grant Year 1 to Grant Year 2, as the contractor was unable to expend the funds before the end of the year. These funds will be used for the same purpose.

Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

No changes are anticipated.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Licensing Website

Budget Table: Project 7					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$900,000.00	$0.00	$900,000.00	$0.00	**$900,000.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$900,000.00	$0.00	$900,000.00	$0.00	**$900,000.00**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$900,000.00	$0.00	$900,000.00	$0.00	**$900,000.00**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$900,000.00**	**$0.00**	**$900,000.00**	**$0.00**	**$900,000.00**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 7 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

No change.

Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

No change.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Linking KEA Data to CALPADS

Budget Table: Project 8					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$19,621.40	$6,028.29	$0.00	**$25,649.69**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$6,143.61	$1,889.60	$0.00	**$8,033.21**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$0.00	$387,296.00	$304,181.47	$0.00	**$691,477.47**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$413,061.01	$312,099.36	$0.00	**$725,160.37**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$93,039.69	$27,824.05	$0.00	**$120,863.74**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$0.00	$506,100.70	$339,923.41	$0.00	**$846,024.11**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$0.00**	**$506,100.70**	**$339,923.41**	**$0.00**	**$846,024.11**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 8 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

The personnel costs were less than anticipated in Grant Year 3. A portion of the savings was moved to Grant Year 4 for personnel and the remainder was used to provide additional funding for the contract. The change to the personnel costs also impacts the Fringe Benefits. There are corresponding changes to the Indirect Costs.

Project 8 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

It is expected that there will be more of a need for staff time in Grant Year 4. Additional funds for the contract will be used to provide outreach to districts, superintendents and principals to encourage the use of the Desired Results Developmental Profile Assessment for both transitional and traditional kindergarten.

Budget Table: Project 9 – PAS/BAS Training For Mentors

Budget Table: Project 9					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$24,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$24,000.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$24,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$24,000.00**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$24,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$24,000.00**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$24,000.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$24,000.00**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 9 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

No change.

Project 9 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

No change.

Budget Table: Project 10 – Electronic Training Materials On Existing Content

Budget Table: Project 10					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$540,216.00	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	**$640,216.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$540,216.00	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	**$640,216.00**
10. Indirect Costs	$113,445.36	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$113,445.36**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$653,661.36	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	**$753,661.36**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$653,661.36**	**$50,000.00**	**$50,000.00**	**$0.00**	**$753,661.36**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 10 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

No change.

Project 10 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

No change.

Budget Table: Project 11 – Professional Development For Early Start

Budget Table: Project 11					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$285,716.00	$285,714.00	$285,714.00	$0.00	**$857,144.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$285,716.00	$285,714.00	$285,714.00	$0.00	**$857,144.00**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$285,716.00	$285,714.00	$285,714.00	$0.00	**$857,144.00**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$285,716.00**	**$285,714.00**	**$285,714.00**	**$0.00**	**$857,144.00**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 11 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

No change.

Project 11 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

No change.

Budget Table: Project 12 – Evaluation

Budget Table: Project 12					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$0.00	$1,701,387.26	$2,592,936.40	$0.00	**$4,294,323.66**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$1,701,387.26	$2,592,936.40	$0.00	**$4,294,323.66**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$113,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$113,000.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$0.00	$1,814,387.26	$2,592,936.40	$0.00	**$4,407,323.66**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$0.00**	**$1,814,387.26**	**$2,592,936.40**	**$0.00**	**$4,407,323.66**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 12 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

No change.

Project 12 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

No change.

Budget Table: Project 13 – Inter-Rater Reliability

Budget Table: Project 13					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$0.00	$8,619.25	$897,593.28	$0.00	**$906,212.53**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$8,619.25	$897,593.28	$0.00	**$906,212.53**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$1,947.95	$55,758.95	$0.00	**$57,706.90**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$0.00	$10,567.20	$953,352.23	$0.00	**$963,919.43**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$0.00**	**$10,567.20**	**$953,352.23**	**$0.00**	**$963,919.43**

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 13 Budget Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

The contract with First 5 California has been executed and the encumbrances have been adjusted to reflect the expected expenditures. The total amount of the contract is less than what was originally planned. In addition, there has been a change in the policy for charging indirect costs beginning in Fiscal Year 14/15 and only the first $250,000 rather than the first $500,000 is subject to indirect cost charges. This resulted in additional savings. The savings from this project has been redirected to Project 2 - Regional Leadership Consortia, Expansion and Related Activities to provide support for the Consortia.

Project 13 Budget Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

First 5 California is now fully staffed for this project. The inter-rater reliability trainings have begun and will continue throughout the life of the grant.