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## Introduction

### Program Overview and Requirements

The California Department of Education (CDE) invites eligible local planning councils (LPCs), resource and referral agencies (R&Rs), or consortiums of the aforementioned entities as delineated on the Letter of Intent (LOI), to apply for grant funding to:

1. Plan for the provision of high-quality Universal PreKindergarten (UPK) options for three- and four-year-old children, through a mixed-delivery system that ensures access to high-quality full- and part-day learning experiences, coordinated services, and referrals for families to access health and social-emotional support services. These programs shall meet the indicators of quality that are codified in California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 8203 and regulated through Title 5.
2. Plan for increasing inclusion of children with exceptional needs in UPK.
3. Assist existing and aspiring UPK site supervisors, teachers, and other support staff in identifying and accessing local workforce pathway programs, including financial support programs, to increase the number of site supervisors, teachers, and other support staff who have required credentials and degrees.
4. Provide outreach services and enrollment support for families of three- or four-year-old children to meet family needs and provide those children with high-quality full- and part-day learning experiences.
5. Partner to plan for, align, and coordinate the plans, and conduct the activities described in paragraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, with all local educational agencies (LEAs) in the county or region that received funding pursuant to the California PreKindergarten Planning and Implementation Grant Program (Article 13.2 [commencing with Section 8281.5]).
6. Partner with tribes to reflect family and tribal community needs, as sovereign nations, in the planning and implementation of the UPK mixed-delivery system.
7. Commit to providing program data to the department, as specified by the Superintendent, including, but not necessarily limited to, plan development steps and participants engaged in the grant activities and planning, core needs of critical communities, including tribal communities, and recipient information and participation in overall program evaluation.
8. Develop a plan for consideration by the governing board or body of the county office of education (COE) at a public meeting on or before June 30, 2023, for how all four-year-old children and an increased number of at-promise three-year-old children in the county may access full-day learning programs before kindergarten that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with the UPK programs in the mixed-delivery system and expanded learning offerings.

The UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant is part of the overarching expansion of UPK in California, which is supported through several funding streams. This includes the California PreKindergarten (PreK) Planning and Implementation Grant Program, which has provided non-competitive apportionments to LEAs for UPK planning and implementation. The California PreK Planning and Implementation Grant Program was established with the goal of expanding access to classroom-based PreK programs at LEAs and to support costs associated with planning and implementing UPK. The UPK Mixed Delivery Grant provides funding on a non-competitive basis to LPCs and R&Rs to partner with all LEAs in the county that received funding pursuant to the California PreK Planning and Implementation Grant Program to plan for their county’s expansion of UPK through the mixed-delivery system, to create alignment and coordination of the template plans submitted for consideration, and to conduct the required activities of this grant.

**Definitions Pertinent to this grant**

“Mixed-delivery system” means a system of early childhood education services that is delivered through a variety of providers, programs, and settings, including Head Start agencies or delegate agencies funded under the Head Start, public, private, or proprietary agencies, including community-based organizations (CBOs), public schools, and LEAs that offer center-based child care and preschool Pre-K programs, tribal child care and preschool Pre-K, and family child care through a Family Child Care Home Education Network (FCCHEN).

 “Universal preschool” means those programs that offer part-day or full-day, or both, educational programs for three- and four-year-old children and may be offered through a mixed-delivery system.

“High quality” refers to programs those programs that meet the indicators of quality that are codified in *EC* Section 8203 and regulated through Title 5.

### Background

Decades of research demonstrate that an early and strong foundation for learning matters. Children who have effective learning opportunities before kindergarten have an advantage in school and in life over children who do not, especially children with adverse childhood experiences. Children who attend quality educational UPK programs are more prepared for school in terms of their early literacy, language, and math skills, their executive function, and social-emotional development. In some cases, preschool participants are less likely to be identified for special education services or to be held back in elementary school than children who do not attend developmentally-informed PreK programs that include strong educational components.

California is now positioning to plan for an expansion of high-quality UPK through the mixed-delivery system for all three- and four-year-old children through bold leadership and extensive investments in the Budget Act of 2022, including the UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant.

The tumult of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 pandemic accelerated a call to action to ensure a strong educational foundation for all children, emphasizing the critical role of our education system in supporting children and families’ needs and how local flexibility fuels community capacity to meet their needs. California’s leaders responded with historic investments in family support, child development and care, and education. Yet, as the Master Plan for Early Learning and Care highlights, realizing the promise of early childhood investments will require all partners—across early learning and care, early education, and expanded learning and extended care communities—to work together to create a stronger system designed to meet the needs of the whole child.

California seeks to set children on a trajectory of lifelong success by investing in early and equitable learning experiences through the planned expansion of universal high-quality educational PreK programs for three- and four-year-old children across the state in a mixed-delivery system funded through the UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant.

### Authorization

The CDE is authorized to administer the UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant through Chapter 2 of Part 6, Division 1 of Title 1 of the California *EC*, Article 13.1, commencing with Section 8320. Full statutory language can be read in Appendix A.

## Description

### Grant Information

This application covers the grant period beginning July 1, 2022, and ending June 30, 2025 (fiscal years [FYs] 2022–23, 2023–24, and 2024–25). The total available funding for the UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant request for data (RFD) is $18.3 million. To the extent funds are available in the annual Budget Act for the 2023–24 and 2024–25 fiscal years, existing grantees shall be eligible to apply for a renewal grant subject to the terms and conditions developed by the CDE.

Grant funding will be dispersed on a non-competitive basis to awarded LPCs and R&Rs based on a funding allotment per county. If a consortium is created, the lead fiscal agency will receive the funding for all counties listed in the consortium.

The funding allotment available per county can be found in Appendix C: County Funding Allocations.

The county allocation is based on the county-level data available to the CDE using methodology pursuant to statutory language (*EC* Section 8320).

### Eligibility Requirements

In order to be eligible to apply for UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant funding, LPCs and R&Rs must have met the requirement of submitting an LOI, or be a member of a consortium who submitted an LOI, by the established deadline, which was December 6, 2022, by 5 p.m. A listing of eligible LPCs and R&Rs who submitted an LOI by the established deadline can be found on the UPK Mixed Delivery Grant RFD web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/profile.asp?id=5927>.

Eligible LPCs and R&Rs must also submit a completed RFD, only one per county or consortium, to be eligible for funding consideration. An LPC may apply independently or on behalf of a consortium of LPCs within the region as delineated on the LOI. If the county’s LPC has supported the R&R on the LOI in applying for the funding in their county, the R&R may apply independently or on behalf of a consortium of R&Rs within their county or region as delineated on the LOI. If applying on behalf of a consortium, the LPC or R&R must:

1. Remain in the consortium as the lead for the entire project period;
2. Act as the fiduciary agent, including compiling and submitting the consortium’s fiscal and programmatic information; and
3. Collect and submit any data from all entities listed in the consortium as required by the CDE.

### Allowable Activities and Costs

The UPK Mixed Delivery funds must be used for the purposes consistent with activities that directly support planning for universal access to high-quality educational PreK programs for three- and four-year-old children across the state through a mixed-delivery system including, but not limited to, purposes specified in the California *EC* Section 8320 (e):

* Assessing the parental preferences and the need for access to available high-quality UPK through a mixed-delivery system for three- and four-year-old children in the county or region by program type.
* Establishing or strengthening partnerships with other providers of early childhood education services and FCCHENs within the county or region’s mixed-delivery system and with tribal partners to ensure that high-quality options for UPK, including inclusive PreK programs and multilingual programs, are available for three- and four-year-old children.
* Engaging in community-level coordination and planning with agencies participating in the county or region’s mixed-delivery system for the implementation of high-quality UPK options. This may include activities to coordinate the single working group required by statute in *EC* Section 8320.
* Planning and coordination with special education local and regional partners, including regional centers and LEAs, to plan for three- and four-year-old children with disabilities in the county or region to have access to UPK through the mixed-delivery system in the least restrictive environment.
* Partnering with the local Quality Counts California to plan for the use of funds and support needed for workforce development, coaching, and other quality improvement activities to support the expansion of high-quality UPK in the mixed-delivery system, as defined in *EC* Section 8320.
* Other costs, as pre-approved by the CDE.

The UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, existing planning resources. The CDE has final discretion as to whether the use of funding is consistent with those expressed purposes.

Sample activities that can be funded through the UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant include, but are not limited to, the following activities and are held to the standard of being necessary, reasonable and justifiable in cost: salaries for a staff position to carry out the coordination, rent for spaces needed to hold the local working group meetings, technical equipment for coordination efforts, stipends for educators sitting on the local workgroup if the workgroup meetings take place outside of normal business hours, and consumables during the local workgroup meetings.

All applicants must comply with the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audits Requirements for Federal Awards, found in the Title 2 *Code of the Federal Regulations*, Part 200, which can be found at <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/CFR-2014-title2-vol1/CFR-2014-title2-vol1-part200/context>, in managing the grant.

In addition, all applicants must comply with the principles and standards specified in the most current California School Accounting Manual, which can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/sa/>.

The CDE Audit Guide, which can be found at <https://eaap.ca.gov/audit-guide/current-audit-guide-booklet/> .

Applicant budgets for the use of the grant funds will be reviewed and approved but not scored. Any items that are determined to be non-allowable, excessive, or inappropriate will be requested to be removed prior to the submitted RFD being accepted in its final form. Awarding funds pursuant to this RFD does not waive CDE's right to later disallow an expense that is not in line with the statutory uses of the money or the above guidance documents.

### Non-Allowable Activities and Costs

All expenditures must contribute to the activities listed above and be reasonable, necessary, and within the project proposal described in the application.

Funds provided under this grant may NOT be used for the following purposes:

* Supplanting of existing funding and efforts
* Planning for the expansion of the mixed-delivery system that does not meet standards in *EC* Section 8203 and regulated by Title 5
* Hourly wage or salary increases for early learning and care teachers
* Stipends that are not associated with the specified allowable categories on the local working group
* Public relations campaigns, media, or communications to directly support a UPK contractor or individual
* Direct service of early learning and care (for example, funding of slots)
* Acquisition of furniture (for example, bookcases, chairs, desks, file cabinets, tables) unless an integral part of an equipment workstation and preapproved by the CDE
* Consumables, with the exception of food services and refreshments (for example, alcoholic beverages, banquets, diapers are not allowed)
* Purchase of buildings
* Personal electronic devices
* Purchase of promotional favors, items, or memorabilia, such as bumper stickers, pencils, pens, T-shirts, gifts, and souvenirs
* Bad debts, including losses (whether actual or estimated) arising from uncollectible accounts and other claims, related collection costs, and related legal costs
* Costs of advertising and public relations designed solely to promote the governmental unit, lead agency, or partners
* Entertainment, including amusement, diversion, and social activities and any expenses directly associated with such costs
* Goods or services for the personal use of the lead agency and partners employees, regardless of whether the cost is reported as taxable income to the employees
* Legal costs incurred in defense of any civil or criminal fraud proceeding; legal expenses for prosecution of claims against the State of California
* Lobbying costs, whether direct or indirect
* Political activities
* Organized fund-raising, including financial campaigns, solicitation of gifts and bequests, and similar expenses incurred to raise capital or obtain contributions
* Out-of-state travel without prior approval, all travel costs that exceed state rates, and travel to states included in Assembly Bill 1887’s travel prohibition list found on the Department of Justice’s Prohibition On State-Funded And State-Sponsored Travel to States with Discriminatory Laws web page at <https://oag.ca.gov/ab1887>
* Materials and supplies for site-level distribution – approved materials and supplies are only those necessary for county-level planning and coordination
* Current year agreement funds to pay prior or future year obligations
* Capital assets such as equipment, land, buildings, vehicles, and so on. Unallowable costs include all costs required to make the item serviceable (for example, taxes, freight, installation costs, site preparation costs, and so on)
* Facilities renovation, improvements, and repairs

Additionally, funds may not be used for implementation of the plan created, nor to fund student capacity (spots or slots) or teacher salaries.

Funded applicants not sure of pre-approval for a particular expense must consult with the Early Education Division (EED) for technical assistance.

### Administrative Indirect Cost Rate

Indirect costs reflect general administration and overhead costs that cannot easily be charged as direct program costs of the programs or activities they benefit from and that are borne by a primary party as a result of activities it charges as direct costs. Indirect costs may not exceed the approved indirect cost rate for the FY in which the funds are spent. For a consortium, only the lead agency of a consortium can charge indirect costs.

The grantee must limit total administrative indirect costs to 10 percent as the approved rate by the CDE for the applicable FY in which the funds are spent, and denote this in their budget documents for approval with the RFD application.

## Application Processes and Procedures

### Timeline\*

| **Key Events** | **Date** |
| --- | --- |
| LOI available | November 18, 2022 |
| LOI due | December 6, 2022 |
| Funding Awards posted | January 23, 2023 |
| RFD available | March 24, 2023 |
| RFD Informational Webinar | March 28, 2023 |
| Application due | April 14, 2023 |
| Grant Award Notification (GAN) sent to eligible applicants for review and signature | April 2023 |
| Signed GANs due to CDE | 10 business days after GANs are released |
| Grant Award Funding Disbursement dispersed for year one | Four to six weeks after date on signed GAN |

\*Dates subject to change by the CDE. For changes in any date information, visit the RFD web page at: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/upkmdpg22rfd.asp>.

### Application Process

Prior to applying, applicants are strongly encouraged to review the RFD Overview and Instructions, the RFD itself, and consider all requirements for eligibility.

Each application submitted must include the following documents:

* **Section I:** Applicant Information
* **Section II:** Applicant Narrative
* **Section III:** Application Data
* **Section IV:** Application Budget
* **Section VI:** Application Agreement and Certification

All applicants must submit one application to the CDE via Snap Survey. Once the application is received, the applicant will automatically receive a notification that their application was submitted successfully.

When submitting an application via Snap Survey, applicants must adhere to character limits for each applicable field. Responses that exceed the character limits will not be captured by the system and will not be reviewed.

If the RFD is not completed in one session, applicants must select the **Save Responses** button located on the bottom of the screen. Once selected, applicants will be redirected to a new browser window to enter their email address. Applicants will then receive an email with a unique web address for entrance back into the RFD. It is recommended that applicants save the application web address.

### Application Checklist Screening Review

Complete applications will be reviewed by the CDE. Incomplete applications and applications not completed in accordance with the instructions and timelines may delay funding disbursement.

The CDE will review all applications for completeness. For those applications that are incomplete, applicants will be informed in writing and must provide a correction within two weeks. All applications not passing the screening process will be notified in writing within 10 days of submittal and given the process for corrections.

If applicants have inquiries as to their applications, they may contact the CDE at [UPKMixedDeliveryGrant@cde.ca.gov](mailto:UPKMixedDeliveryGrant@cde.ca.gov).

### Awarding of Funding

The total allocation of funding for the UPK Mixed Delivery Grant is $18.3 million in FY 2023–24, and to the extent funds are available in the annual Budget Act for FYs 2023–24 and 2024–25, existing grantees shall be eligible to apply for a renewal grant. The funding will be released to LPCs and R&Rs from funds appropriated by *EC* Section 8320 for the goal of expanding access universally to PreK programs for three- and four-year-old children across the state through a mixed-delivery system. Allocations may be adjusted in subsequent years.

Funds for the UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant are allocated based on a formula specified in *EC* Section 8320. Funds will be allocated using a methodology for determining the amount of funds in each county that accounts for all of the following:

1. Base grant funding that reflects the number of three- and four-year-old children in the county or region.
2. Add-on funding that reflects both of the following:
3. The number of three- and four-year-old children in the county or region who are currently eligible for, but not enrolled in, subsidized PreK programs as part of the mixed-delivery system for UPK, as determined by the Superintendent.
4. The number of three- and four-year-old children with exceptional needs in the county or region.

Funding will be awarded to all eligible applicants that submit all required information as noted in this RFD. If there is additional funding that was not applied for, the CDE may adjust the allocation amounts accordingly.

The CDE has the right to check the accuracy of the information provided in this RFD to ensure accuracy prior to making any awards.

Funds that are allocated for this grant shall be expended by June 30, 2026. The CDE will then initiate collection proceedings for unexpended funds.

### Technical Assistance

Questions regarding the application and its process can be submitted to UPK [UPKMixedDeliveryGrant@cde.ca.gov](mailto:UPKMixedDeliveryGrant@cde.ca.gov) with the LPC or R&R name in the subject line.

A Frequently Asked Questions section will be made available on the RFD web page after the release of the RFD at: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/upkmdpg22rfd.asp>.

The CDE will conduct an RFD informational webinar session after the release of the RFD to provide an overview of the RFD and offer potential applicants an opportunity to ask clarifying questions.

### Grant Award Notification

Applicants selected for funding will receive a GAN, the official CDE document that awards funds to local projects. Grantees must sign and return the notification to the CDE before funds are disbursed. A signature on the GAN indicates that the awardee will comply with all the grant requirements.

### Accountability – Reporting Requirements

Ongoing communication with the CDE is an integral part of the reporting requirements. The grantees will be made aware of technical assistance webinars to attend. The CDE will additionally provide the ability for grantees to meet with the CDE grant team individually when needed.

Additionally, the following regular reporting must be completed and submitted by each grantee:

* A semiannual fiscal activity report;
* A semiannual programmatic narrative progress report that includes a description of accomplishments, challenges, identified resources, effective practices, and next steps to be developed; and
* An annual program report including data on the implementation of the goals and activities described in statute and provided on the template that CDE will provide.

If the required reports are not provided in a timely manner or program activities are not timely completed, the CDE may suspend funding to the grantee and, unless satisfactorily remedied, may terminate funding altogether. The department shall initiate collection proceedings for grant funds used by grantees in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section, including, but not limited to, failing to submit all required data pursuant to statute.

The CDE has created a Planning Template to assist grantees in creating their plan to be presented plan for consideration by the governing board or body of the county office of education at a public meeting on or before June 30, 2023, for how all four-year-old children and an increased number of at-promise three-year-old children in the county may access full-day learning programs before kindergarten that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with the universal preschool programs in the mixed-delivery system and expanded learning offerings. The Planning Template is found in the Appendices.

## UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant Application

### Application Instructions

Prior to submitting an application, applicants are strongly encouraged to read the entire UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant Program RFD. The following items must be completed for all sections, as outlined below. The applicant will use Snap Survey to input responses, which can be found on the grant’s RFD web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/profile.asp?id=5927>.

The UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant application consists of the following sections:

1. Section I: Applicant Information (Required)
2. Section II: Application Program Narrative (Required)
3. Section III: Application Budget
4. Budget Summary (Required)
5. Budget Narrative (Required)
6. Section IV: Application Agreement and Certification (Required)

As a reminder, only applications that submit all required sections will be eligible for funding. The CDE will notify counties that have not submitted an RFD to allow them the opportunity to do so.

Please note that the CDE reserves the right to double-check the accuracy of the data provided and to disallow any applications that contain data that is inaccurate or cannot be confirmed.

The CDE will award funding within each county at the full amount of each county’s allocated amount annually.

If there is additional funding remaining in a county’s allocation after all eligible applicants have been funded, and the county chooses not to apply for the funds, the funds unspent will be redistributed to existing grantees.

#### Section I: Applicant Information

| **Application Field** | **Instructions** |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant Agency or lead Applicant applying on behalf of the consortium** | Provide the name of the entity applying for the grant |
| **Type of Entity Applying** | Select “Local Planning Council (LPC)”, “Resource and Referral Agency (R&R)”, “LPC Consortium,” or “R&R Consortium” |
| **If applying on behalf of a consortium, list all counties involved** | If applicable, insert the names of the entities that are a part of the consortium, separated by a comma in between each agency |
| **If applying on behalf of a consortium – list all LPCs in the counties** | All LPCs must be made aware that a consortium is formed, whether of LPCs or R&Rs – list the LPC agency names |
| **Upload signature page for R&Rs and LPCs** | The county application must contain a signed agreement from the R&Rs in the county and the LPC. – upload the form provided by the CDE on the funding page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/profile.asp?id=5927> |
| **Programmatic Point of Contact** | Insert the name of the person who has the authority to sign and engage with the CDE |
| **Programmatic Point of Contact’s Office, Telephone Number, Extension (If Applicable), and Email Address** | Insert the office name, telephone number, extension number (if applicable), and email address of the Point of Contact |
| **Fiscal Contact** | Insert the name of the person who has the authority to sign and engage with the CDE |
| **Fiscal Contact’s Office, Telephone Number, Extension (If Applicable), and Email Address** | Insert the office name, telephone number, extension number (if applicable), and email address of the Point of Contact |
| **County** | Provide the applying entity’s county of service |
| **Commit to Submit Data [tick yes]** | Tick the box next to “yes” to ensure you commit to providing program data to the department, as specified by the Superintendent, including, but not limited to, plan development steps and participants engaged in the grant activities and planning, core needs of critical communities, including tribal communities, and recipient information and participation in overall program evaluation |
| **Intent to submit plan for consideration by June 30, 2023 [tick yes]** | Tick the box next to “yes” to confirm you commit to developing a plan for consideration by the governing board or body of the county office of education at a public meeting on or before June 30, 2023, for how all four-year-old children and an increased number of at-promise three-year-old children in the county may access full-day learning programs before kindergarten that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with the UPK programs in the mixed-delivery system and expanded learning offerings |

#### Section II: Application Narrative

The following requirements must be adhered to for the written narratives.

1. The information included in the application must be relevant to the program being administered by the applicant.
2. Applicants are welcome to use responses developed or in development for their county’s LEA or COE UPK P&I Template to answer the questions raised in the narrative section. The template can be found on the UPK and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) elementary web page at: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/em/index.asp>.
3. Inclusion of false or misleading information will not be accepted.

**Required Activities Questions**

1. Describe in detail how the applicant will partner with the COE and other LEAs in the county on the work required under the UPK P&I Grant to ensure activities conducted under this grant meet community needs for UPK in a mixed-delivery system not already addressed in the LEA or COE UPK plans. (Applicants will have a limit of 5000 characters to complete this question). The requirements for the UPK Mixed Delivery Grant can be found at *EC* Section 8320 [at](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB185) <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB185>.
2. Describe in detail how you will achieve the task of partnering to plan for, align and coordinate the plans, and conduct the activities described below with all LEAs in the county that received funding pursuant to the California Prekindergarten Planning and Implementation Grant Program (Article 13.2 [commencing with Section 8281.5]).
   1. Partner to plan for the provision of high-quality UPK options for three- and four-year-old children through a mixed-delivery system that ensures access to high-quality full- and part-day learning experiences, coordinated services, and referrals for families to access health and social-emotional support services. Indicators of quality shall meet *EC* Section 8203 and be regulated by Title 5 (applicants will have a limit of 5,000 characters to complete this question).
   2. Partner to plan for increasing inclusion of children with exceptional needs in UPK (applicants will have a limit of 5,000 characters to complete this question).
   3. Partner to plan for the assistance of existing and aspiring UPK site supervisors, teachers, and other support staff in identifying and accessing local workforce pathway programs, including financial support programs, to increase the number of site supervisors, teachers, and other support staff who have the required credentials and degrees (applicants will have a limit of 5,000 characters to complete this question).
   4. Partner to plan for the provision of outreach services and enrollment support for families of three- or four-year-old children to meet family needs and provide those children with high-quality full- and part-day learning experiences (Applicants will have a limit of 5,000 characters to complete this question).
3. Describe in detail how the applicant will achieve the task of partnering with tribes to reflect family and tribal community needs, as sovereign nations, in the planning and implementation of the UPK mixed-delivery system (applicants will have a limit of 5,000 characters to complete this question).

#### Section III: Documents to Upload: Application Budget Summary, Budget Narrative and Signature Form

A projected budget for FY 2022–23 (July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023) is required for the application.

Applicants must use the UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant Proposed Budget Summary and Narrative documents available on the UPK Mixed Delivery Planning Grant RFD web page at: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/upkmdpg22rfd.asp>. Applicants will combine the Proposed Budget Summary, Narrative, and Signature Form templates into a ZIP file, and will attach the ZIP file to their Snap Survey application.

**The Proposed Budget Summary** (Required)

Applicants must provide totals for each Object Code and should align with the Proposed Budget Detail. Applicants should group line items by the object code series and provide lines for object code totals. The Proposed Budget Summary includes one project year:

* **Project Year 1:** July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023

**The Proposed Budget Narrative** (Required)

Applicants must provide a completed Proposed Budget Narrative, which will provide sufficient detail for each identified cost associated with implementing the proposed goals and activities, including why the costs are reasonable and necessary to support the proposal’s goals and activities.

The CDE will review the narrative section of the application and the budget for completion, cost-effectiveness, and the level of detail provided. The awarding of funding does not mean that all proposed costs have been approved costs, as they must first be permitted by statutory and regulatory authority.

**Signature Form**

Pursuant to *Education Code (EC)* Section 8320 each county’s Request for Data (RFD) application must contain a signed agreement from the LPC representative and **all** R&R agencies in the county or consortium.

If your county is part of a consortium, **all** LPCs and R&Rs in the counties represented must sign the agreement.

*EC* 8320: <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=8320.&lawCode=EDC>

1. Upload the budget summary and the budget narrative outlining how funding will be allocated to each of the above tasks as listed in questions 1-4, along with the Signature Form, in a ZIP file into the survey submission. All RFD forms can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/upkmdpg22rfd.asp>.

#### Section VI: Application Agreement and Certification [Tick Yes Box]

The applicant will be prompted via Snap Survey to sign the application electronically and certify that the information provided in the application is correct and complete.

## Appendices

### **Statutory Language**

ARTICLE 13.1. California Universal Preschool Planning Grant Program [8320–8320. (Article 13.1 added by Stats. 2022, Ch. 62, Sec. 11.)

8320.

(a) The California Universal Preschool Planning Grant Program is hereby established with the goal of expanding access universally to preschool programs for three- and four-year-old children across the state through a mixed-delivery system.

(b) As used in this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) “Children with exceptional needs” has the same meaning as defined in Section 8205.

(2) “Mixed-delivery system” means a system of early childhood education services that is delivered through a variety of providers, programs, and settings, including Head Start agencies or delegate agencies funded under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 9831, et seq.), public, private, or proprietary agencies, including community-based organizations, public schools, and local education agencies that offer center-based childcare and preschool programs, tribal childcare and preschool, and family childcare through a family childcare home education network.

(3) “Three- and four-year-old children” has the same meaning as “three-year-old children” and “four-year-old children,” as those terms are defined in Section 8205.

(4) “Universal preschool” means those programs that offer part-day or full-day, or both, educational programs for three- and four-year-old children, and may be offered through a mixed-delivery system.

(c) (1) (A) Pursuant to an appropriation in the annual Budget Act, for each of the 2022–23, 2023–24, and 2024–25 fiscal years, the Superintendent shall consult with the Director of Social Services and shall create an application to award grant funds to one designated lead agency within each county, as set forth in this section. Each county shall submit a single planning grant application.

(B) The county grant submission shall contain a signed agreement from the resource and referral agencies in the county and the local planning council.

(2) (A) (i) A local planning council established pursuant to Article 2 (commencing with Section 10485) of Chapter 31 of Part 1.8 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code shall have first priority for grant awards from their county’s allocation funds calculated for each county, as described paragraph (1) of subdivision (d).

(ii) A local planning council shall express interest through submitting a letter of intent to the department on a template developed by the Superintendent in consultation with the State Department of Social Services.

(iii) If a local planning council wishes to partner with other counties in their region pursuant to subdivision (j), the local planning council shall indicate this intent in their letter of intent.

(B) (i) In counties where the local planning council does not submit a letter of intent to receive an award, a resource and referral agency established pursuant to Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 10217) of Part 1.8 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code that operates in the county may submit a joint letter of intent with the local planning council to the Superintendent, on a template developed by the Superintendent in consultation with the State Department of Social Services, indicating interest in conducting the activities of this grant in their county.

(ii) The joint letter submitted pursuant to clause (i) shall designate a lead fiscal agency and describe the partnership the resource and referral agencies will use to meet the requirements of the grant.

(iii) If a resource and referral agency wishes to partner with other counties in their region pursuant to subdivision (j), the resource and referral agency shall indicate this intent in their letter of intent.

(C) Once letters of intent have been submitted, the Superintendent shall require the designated lead agency from each county to submit an application containing information, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(i) A description of how it will allocate funds and achieve tasks described in subdivision (f).

(ii) A description of how the applicant will partner with the county office of education and other local educational agencies in the county on the work required pursuant to Section 8281.5, to ensure activities conducted under this grant meet community needs for universal preschool in a mixed-delivery system not already addressed.

(D) All grantees shall be required to coordinate with the county office of education on the work required pursuant to Section 8281.5. In counties where the county office of education operates the resource and referral agency or the local planning council, the staff responsible for those activities at the county office of education shall be included and financially supported to participate in the activities of this grant.

(E) The grantee shall form a single working group that shall include, but not be limited to, representatives from the county offices of education, school districts, charter schools offering transitional kindergarten, resource and referral programs, alternative payment programs operating preschool programs, First 5 county commissions, contracted state preschool programs, including both local education agency and community-based organization programs, general childcare programs serving preschool-age children, tribal preschool programs, private center-based childcare preschool providers, licensed family childcare providers, educators, exclusive bargaining representatives, Head Start, faculty at local institutions of higher education focusing on child development or early childhood education, and early childhood education teacher preparation programs, including institutions of higher education.

(d) The Superintendent shall develop and administer a grant process and award grant funds to each county that applies for funding for the 2022–23 fiscal year as long as the application is in conformance with the requirements of this section. Funds shall be allocated using a methodology for determining the amount of funds in each county that accounts for all of the following:

(1) (A) Base grant funding that reflects the number of three- and four-year-old children in the county or region.

(B) Add-on funding that reflects both of the following:

(i) The number of three- and four-year-old children in the county or region who are currently eligible for, but not enrolled in, subsidized preschool programs as part of the mixed-delivery system for universal preschool, as determined by the Superintendent.

(ii) The number of three- and four-year-old children with exceptional needs in the county or region.

(2) To the extent funds are available in the annual Budget Act for the 2023–24 and 2024–25 fiscal years, existing grantees shall be eligible to apply for a renewal grant subject to the terms and conditions developed by the Superintendent.

(e) Grant funds may be used for costs associated with any of the following:

(1) Assessing the parental preferences and the need for access to available high-quality universal preschool through a mixed-delivery system for three- and four-year-old children in the county or region by program type.

(2) Establishing or strengthening partnerships with other providers of early childhood education services and family childcare home education networks within the county or region’s mixed-delivery system and with tribal partners, to ensure that high-quality options for universal preschool, including inclusive preschool programs and multilingual programs, are available for three- and four-year-old children.

(3) Engaging in community-level coordination and planning with agencies participating in the county or region’s mixed-delivery system for the implementation of high-quality universal preschool options.

(4) Coordinating with special education local and regional partners, including regional centers and local educational agencies, to ensure three- and four-year-old children with exceptional needs in the county or region have access to universal preschool through the mixed-delivery system in the least restrictive environment in accordance with Section 1412(a)(5)(A) of Title 20 of the United States Code.

(5) Partnering with the regional agency responsible for the system described in Section 8203.1 to fund and support workforce development, coaching, and other quality improvement activities to support the universal preschool mixed-delivery system.

(6) Other costs, as specified by the Superintendent.

(f) Entities receiving grants pursuant to this subdivision shall do all of the following:

(1) Plan for the provision of high-quality universal preschool options for three- and four-year-old children, through a mixed-delivery system that ensures access to high-quality full- and part-day learning experiences, coordinated services, and referrals for families to access health and social-emotional support services. Indicators of quality shall be determined by the Superintendent pursuant to Section 8203.

(2) Plan for increasing inclusion of children with exceptional needs in universal preschool.

(3) Assist existing and aspiring universal preschool site supervisors, teachers, and other support staff in identifying and accessing local workforce pathway programs, including financial support programs, to increase the number of site supervisors, teachers, and other support staff who have required credentials and degrees.

(4) Provide outreach services and enrollment support for families of three- or four-year-old children, to meet family needs and provide those children with high-quality full- and part-day learning experiences.

(5) Partner to plan for, align and coordinate the plans, and conduct the activities described in paragraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, with all local educational agencies in the county or region that received funding pursuant to the California Prekindergarten Planning and Implementation Grant Program (Article 13.2 (commencing with Section 8281.5)).

(6) Partner with tribes to reflect family and tribal community needs, as sovereign nations, in the planning and implementation of the universal preschool mixed-delivery system.

(7) Commit to providing program data to the department, as specified by the Superintendent, including, but not necessarily limited to, plan development steps and participants engaged in the grant activities and planning, core needs of critical communities, including tribal communities, and recipient information and participation in overall program evaluation.

(8) Develop a plan for consideration by the governing board or body of the county office of education at a public meeting on or before June 30, 2023, for how all four-year-old children and an increased number of at-promise three-year-old children in the county may access full-day learning programs before kindergarten that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with the universal preschool programs in the mixed-delivery system and expanded learning offerings.

(g) If the entity receiving the grant in a county is a local planning council, the local planning council shall collaborate with, and subgrant funds where appropriate to, local resource and referral agencies to implement the activities of this section.

(h) If the entity receiving the grant in a county is a resource and referral agency, the resource and referral agency shall collaborate with, and subgrant funds where appropriate to, the local planning council to implement the activities of this section.

(i) (A) Funds that are allocated or awarded pursuant to this section shall be expended by June 30, 2026. The department shall then initiate collection proceedings for unexpended funds.

(B) The department shall initiate collection proceedings for grant funds used by grantees in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section, including, but not limited to, failing to submit all required data pursuant to subdivision (f).

(j) Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting counties from joining together to address regional needs with their funding and developing regional plans.

### Key Terms and Acronyms

| **Terms and Acronyms** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant** | An LPC or R&R that requests funding from a grant program administered by the CDE. |
| **CBO** | Community-based organization |
| **CDE** | California Department of Education |
| **Children with Special Needs** | “Children with exceptional needs” has the same meaning as defined in *EC* 8205. |
| **COE** | County office of education |
| ***EC*** | California *Education Code* |
| **EED** | The Early Education Division of the California Department of Education. EED was previously known as the Early Learning and Care Division. |
| **Expanded Learning** | Before-school, after-school, summer, or intersession learning programs that focus on developing the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs and interests of pupils through hands-on, engaging learning experiences. It is the intent of the Legislature that learning programs are pupil-centered, results-driven, include community partners, and complement, but do not replicate, learning activities in the regular school day and school year. |
| **Grantee** | An applicant who is funded pursuant to an approved award notification. |
| **High-Quality** | Meeting the standards pursuant to *EC* 8203 and regulated by Title 5. |
| **Inclusion** | The right of every eligible child, regardless of ability, to participate as full members in high-quality early learning and care programs through access, participation, and support. |
| **LEA** | A local educational agency. For purposes of this RFD, LEA may include school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools. |
| **LOI** | Letter of Intent. |
| **LPC** | A local planning council established pursuant to Article 2 (commencing with Section 10485) of Chapter 31 of Part 1.8 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. |
| **Mixed-Delivery System** | “Mixed-delivery system” means a system of early childhood education services that is delivered through a variety of providers, programs, and settings, including Head Start agencies or delegate agencies funded under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 9831, et seq.), public, private, or proprietary agencies, including community-based organizations, public schools, and local education agencies that offer center-based childcare and preschool programs, tribal childcare and preschool, and family childcare through a family childcare home education network |
| **RFD** | Request for Data |
| **R&R** | A resource and referral agency established pursuant to Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 10217) of Part 1.8 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. |
| **SSPI** | State Superintendent of Public Instruction, California Department of Education |
| **Three- and four-year-old children** | “Three- and four-year-old children” has the same meaning as “three-year-old children” and “four-year-old children,” as those terms are defined in Section 8205. |
| **Universal Preschool** | “Universal preschool” means those programs that offer part-day or full-day, or both, educational programs for three- and four-year-old children, and may be offered through a mixed-delivery system. |
| **UPK** | Universal PreKindergarten, which is inclusive of CSPP, Head Start, TK, Expanded Learning, and CBO preschool programs. |

### Final County Funding Allocation

Note: Recipients and funding amounts are subject to budget and administrative adjustments.

| **County** | **Funding** |
| --- | --- |
| Alameda | $487,055.00 |
| Alpine | $30,009.00 |
| Amador | $62,596.00 |
| Butte | $187,651.00 |
| Calaveras | $65,348.00 |
| Colusa | $61,558.00 |
| Contra Costa | $446,410.00 |
| Del Norte | $62,373.00 |
| El Dorado | $179,045.00 |
| Fresno | $565,270.00 |
| Glenn | $64,958.00 |
| Humboldt | $176,418.00 |
| Imperial | $213,882.00 |
| Inyo | $61,528.00 |
| Kern | $530,790.00 |
| Kings | $194,689.00 |
| Lake | $65,359.00 |
| Lassen | $61,667.00 |
| Los Angeles | $3,243,104.00 |
| Madera | $191,505.00 |
| Marin | $180,444.00 |
| Mariposa | $57,212.00 |
| Mendocino | $72,992.00 |
| Merced | $226,028.00 |
| Modoc | $56,739.00 |
| Mono | $57,335.00 |
| Monterey | $349,184.00 |
| Napa | $178,861.00 |
| Nevada | $70,907.00 |
| Orange | $924,103.00 |
| Placer | $230,520.00 |
| Plumas | $58,713.00 |
| Riverside | $870,945.00 |
| Sacramento | $609,842.00 |
| San Benito | $74,619.00 |
| San Bernardino | $850,342.00 |
| San Diego | $1,046,070.00 |
| San Francisco | $290,854.00 |
| San Joaquin | $493,152.00 |
| San Luis Obispo | $197,986.00 |
| San Mateo | $368,705.00 |
| Santa Barbara | $353,788.00 |
| Santa Clara | $514,191.00 |
| Santa Cruz | $202,008.00 |
| Shasta | $192,598.00 |
| Sierra | $40,292.00 |
| Siskiyou | $63,538.00 |
| Solano | $362,391.00 |
| Sonoma | $352,699.00 |
| Stanislaus | $425,275.00 |
| Sutter | $176,895.00 |
| Tehama | $69,707.00 |
| Trinity | $55,661.00 |
| Tulare | $374,350.00 |
| Tuolumne | $61,380.00 |
| Ventura | $477,178.00 |
| Yolo | $189,274.00 |
| Yuba | $172,007.00 |
| **Total** | **$18,300,000.00** |

### Planning Template

#### Planning Template Self-Certification

In the data collection survey submitted to the CDE, the grantee must self-certify they developed a plan for consideration by the governing board or body of the county office of education at a public meeting on or before June 30, 2023, for how all four-year-old children and an increased number of at-promise three-year-old children in the county will be able to access full-day learning programs before kindergarten that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with school districts, high-quality the universal preschool programs in the mixed-delivery system and expanded learning offerings in their communities.

1. Please complete the following table:

| **County** | **Contact Name and Title of the Individual Self-Certifying the Statement Above** | **Email of the Individual Self-Certifying the Statement Above** | **Phone Number of the Individual Self-Certifying the Statement Above** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Enter name here] | [Enter contact name and title here] | [Enter email here] | [Enter phone number here] |

1. On what date was the plan presented for consideration?
2. [calendar drop down]
3. Did the grantee develop a joint plan in a consortium?
   1. Yes
   2. No
4. If the grantee answered Yes to Question 3, for each county in the consortium please list the county, the name of the agency in the county, the contact's name and title in that agency, the email for that agency’s contact, and the contact’s phone number. [open response]
5. Please certify that you have shared a copy of the plan submitted for consideration on June 30, 2023, with the LEAs in your county
   1. Yes
   2. No
6. Did the grantee subgrant funds to either the Local Planning Council or the Resource and Referral agencies in the county?
   1. Yes
   2. No
7. If the grantee answered yes to question 7, please list the following information for the agency that was sub granted funds: Type of agency (LPC or R&R) Name of the agency, name and phone number of the contact at the agency

[open response]

The grantee commits to providing program data to the CDE including, but not limited to, plan development steps and participants engaged in the grant activities and planning, core needs of critical communities, including tribal nations, and recipient information and participation in overall program evaluation as requested intermittently by the CDE.

* 1. I agree [check box]

#### Projected Enrollment and Needs Assessment

1. Which existing data sources have you reviewed to indicate **parental preferences** related to early learning and care programs for three- and four-year-old children in the county?
   1. LPC Needs Assessment data
   2. Local Resource and Referral agency data
   3. Head Start Needs Assessments
   4. Head Start Needs Assessments inclusive of Tribal Head Start and Migrant/Seasonal Head Start
   5. Family or parent surveys
   6. Data collected by Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs)
   7. Local First 5 County Commission data or reports
   8. American Institute for Research Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool
   9. Preschool Development Grant Needs Assessment
   10. Other [describe, open response]
2. How will the grantee assess access, and gaps in availability of high-quality UPK options. meeting Title 5 standards through a mixed-delivery system for three- and four- year- old children in the county?
3. LPC Needs Assessment data
4. Local Resource and Referral agency data
5. Head Start Needs Assessments
6. Family or parent surveys
7. Data collected by Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs)
8. Local First 5 County Commission data or reports
9. American Institute for Research Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool
10. Preschool Development Grant Needs Assessment
11. Title VI Indian Education Data
12. Other [describe, open response
13. What activities will the grantee pursue to establish or strengthen partnerships with those in the mixed-delivery system as they work to enhance or to develop and conduct needs assessments?
    1. Invite potential partners to public meetings
14. Reach out to meet/discuss needs assessments with potential partners individually
15. Reach out with questions about specific data sources and any gaps the grantee has identified
16. Other [fill in]
17. Per the Needs Assessment indicate the need for expansion in the following programs of the mixed-delivery system
    1. Full Day program- [drop down: significant moderate low need]
    2. Part Day programs – [drop down: significant moderate low need]
    3. Head Start inclusive of Tribal Head Start and Migrant/Seasonal Head Start – [drop down: significant moderate low need]
    4. Preschools on LEA campuses - [drop down: significant moderate low need]
    5. Preschool in Community Based Organizations - [drop down: significant moderate low need]
    6. Tribal preschool- [drop down: significant moderate low need]
    7. CSPP through a FCCHEN -[drop down: significant moderate low need]
    8. Inclusive preschool programs - [drop down: significant moderate low need]
    9. Multilingual programs - [drop down: significant moderate low need]
    10. Other (open response) - [drop down: significant moderate low need]

5. How are you gathering information from UPK programs to determine locations,

including from districts to determine TK locations, and from other UPK

programs such as CSPP and Head Start?

1. Review of district UPK Planning and Implementation data
2. Outreach to COE staff responsible for supporting UPK P&I
3. Other [Open Response]

6. What outreach services do you plan to provide to support enrollment?

1. Partnerships with local libraries
2. Partnerships with local community-based organizations that provide preschool
3. Communications with parents
4. Mail campaigns
5. Partnerships with local healthcare providers
6. Partnerships with Tribal Health centers/clinics
7. Open houses for parents/ enrollment nights
8. Creating as support helpline
9. Enrollment reminder flyers
10. Partnership with the LPC and R&R to ensure all agencies have full details on each program and eligibility in order to make referrals for families (including TK, license-exempt, CSPP, Head Start, etc.)
11. Partnerships with Tribal Nations that have preschool programs
12. Partnerships with Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
13. Other [Open Response]

7. How are you working to reach out to specific racial and ethnic groups with

trusted community messengers?

1. Communications or meetings with local tribal education entity (or specific tribes in community)
2. Identify and reaching out to local cultural community leaders
3. Other [Open Response]

#### Focus Area A: Vision and Coherence

1. What is the grantee's vision for supporting UPK through a mixed-delivery model and how does this complement the County Office of Education's and relevant LEAs’ vision as put forth in their plans?
2. [open response]

2. What partners have you included in your planning effort?

* 1. LEAs [drop down once clicked to denote the following question]
     1. List the name of the LEAs partnered with [open response]
     2. List the name of the representative from the LEA that was the point of contact [open response]
  2. County Office of Education [drop down once clicked to denote the following question]
     1. List the name of the county office of education (COE) partnered with [tick a drop-down list of COEs in California]
     2. List the name of the representative from the county office of education that was the point of contact [Open Response]
  3. What other partners have you included in your planning efforts [select all that apply]
     1. Local Parent Groups
     2. Family Resource Centers
     3. Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)
     4. Tribal Nations
     5. Local First 5 County Commission
     6. Local Head Start Programs
     7. Local Parent engagement centers (for example, Parent Training and Information Center [PTIC], Community Parent Resource Center [CPRC], Family Empowerment Centers [FEC])
     8. Local workforce development agencies
     9. County child welfare departments
     10. County Department of Social Services Administrators who oversee CalWORKS
     11. Alternative Payment Programs
     12. Other [describe, open response]

3. Which of the following plans have you reviewed and aligned your plan to?

1. The county’s local planning council (LPC) countywide comprehensive
2. childcare plan
3. The UPK plans of LEAs in the county
4. The LCAP plans of LEAs in county
5. Local QCC Quality Improvement Plans through the local First 5
6. County Office of Education workforce plan submitted for the Early Education Teacher Development Grant (EETD)

4. Describe the recognized gaps for each Focus Area in the LEA and COE plans that needs to be addressed in the UPK Mixed Delivery Plan?

1. Projected enrollment and needs assessment [open response]
2. Focus Area A: Vision and Coherence [open response]
3. Focus Area B: Community Engagement and Partnerships [open response]
4. Focus Area C: Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning [open response]
5. Focus Area D: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment [open response]
6. Focus Area E: Facilities, Services, and Operations [open response]

5. During the engagement with the LEAs, did the LEAs express that they had updated their plan or have thought about updating their original plan?

a. Amount of LEAs who have updated their plans [most, some, few, none]

b. Amount of LEAs who have not updated their plans

[most, some, few, none]

c. Amount of LEAs who have expressed interest in updating their plans

[most, some, few, none]

d. Amount of LEAs who have expressed they are not interested in

updating their plans [most, some, few, none]

e. This was not discussed during the partnership

6. What methods did you utilize to coordinate and align plans with partner LEAs within the county or region?

a. Co-planning sessions or workshops

b. Informational meetings

c. Surveys

d. Input sessions

e. Reviewing existing LEA/COE plans

g. Interviews

h. Information gathering a COE about LEA support the COE is providing

i. Other [Open Response]

7. Identify which of the following opportunities the grantee implemented to obtain

public input on the UPK Mixed Delivery Plan. [Select all that apply]

* 1. Parent Teacher Association Meetings
  2. Family or parent surveys
  3. English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC)
  4. District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC)
  5. Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)
  6. School Site Council
  7. District Advisory Committee
  8. LCAP educational partners input sessions
  9. Tribal Community input session(s)
  10. Co-hosting events with community-based organizations (CBOs)
  11. Hosting meet and greets with the early learning and care community
  12. LPC Meetings
  13. Local Quality Counts California (QCC) consortia meetings
  14. First 5 County Commission meetings
  15. Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
  16. Head Start Policy Council meetings
  17. Collaboration with parent engagement centers (for example, Parent
      1. Training and Information Center [PTIC], Community Parent
      2. Resource Center [CPRC], Family Empowerment Centers [FEC])
  18. Other [describe, open response]

8. What is the grantee learning about UPK planning and implementation locally?

a. [open response]

9. What are the challenges that the grantee is encountering?

a. [open response]

#### Focus Area B: Community Engagement and Partnerships

1. How is the grantee supporting collaboration of providers in the mixed-delivery system?
   1. Holding collaboration / input sessions held at the COE/ LEA
   2. Holding input sessions at a location convenient for interest holders such as a Tribal Community Center
   3. Reaching out to support attendance at previously planned/ regularly scheduled meetings
   4. Providing guidance
   5. Sharing contact information
   6. Holding networking events
   7. Other [open response]
2. How is the grantee engaging with LEAs to encourage them to collaborate with providers in the mixed-delivery system?
   1. Holding collaboration / input sessions
   2. Providing guidance
   3. Reaching out to support attendance at previously planned/ regularly scheduled meetings
   4. Sharing contact information
   5. Holding networking events
   6. Other [open response]
3. What kinds of outreach is the grantee planning to do to support families to understand their UPK options, including eligibility, within the mixed-delivery system (including TK and CSPP offered by LEAs)?
   1. Webinar
   2. Open house
   3. Flyers
   4. Surveys
   5. Family intake interviews
   6. Focus groups within communities
   7. Other [open response]
4. How does the grantee plan to coordinate with special education local and regional partners, including LEAs and regional centers, to ensure 3- and 4-year-old children with exceptional needs in the county/region have access to UPK in the least restrictive environment?
   1. [open response]
5. Who are the local and regional partners the grantee engaged in planning toward increasing inclusion of children with disabilities in UPK?
   1. Social Services
   2. Bargaining Units
   3. SELPA
   4. LEAs
   5. Head Start
   6. Tribal Head Start
   7. Migrant/Seasonal Head Start
   8. Parents
   9. Other [fill in]
6. Which data sources does the grantee plan to utilize to understand parental/family preferences and needs for access to UPK for children with disabilities?
   1. LPC Needs Assessment data
   2. Local Resource and Referral agency data
   3. Head Start Needs Assessments
   4. Head Start Needs Assessments inclusive of Tribal Head Start and Migrant/Seasonal Head Start
   5. Family or parent surveys
   6. Data collected by Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs)
   7. Local First 5 County Commission data or reports
   8. American Institute for Research Early Learning Needs Assessment Tool
   9. Preschool Development Grant Needs Assessment
   10. IEP meeting information
   11. Family enrollment needs assessment
   12. ASQ information
   13. Early Start Regional Program Data
   14. Other [describe, open response]
7. What Tribal Nations did you reach out to?

[open response or drop down] – for more information, see <https://cdegis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=fe8263d1adc5411e8a60a402847c9e37>

1. If you did reach out to a tribe(s), through which entity did you reach out to them? [drop down]
2. Tribal Chair and Council
3. Tribal childcare programs
4. TCCAC
5. Our agency reached out to a Tribal Nation in our county, but were unable to connect
6. Our agency did not reach out to a Tribal Nation in our county
7. What specific ways were Tribal Nation(s) engaged in the actual planning processes?
   1. [Open Response]
8. How have grantees involved local community-based organizations (CBOs) in planning for expanded learning opportunity programs?
9. Invited organization to planning sessions
10. Created a specific plan to encourage collaboration between the LEA and CBOs on enrollment, communication and outreach to families
11. Allocated budgets to compensate CBOs for work related to expanded learning opportunity programs
12. Other [open response]
13. How has the grantee been in contact with the local community-based organizations that provide expanded learning opportunities in order to create a plan for UPK expansion?
    1. [open response]
14. What activities will the grantee support to increase access for four-year-old children and at-promise three-year-old children (children who are income-eligible for the California State Preschool Program) in the county to full-day learning programs before kindergarten? [check all that apply]
    1. Connect mixed-delivery partners to discuss and coordinate partnership options for full-day offerings.
    2. Convene mixed-delivery partners to discuss and coordinate partnership options for full-day offerings.
    3. Provide information to mixed-delivery partners about parental need for full-day care in your community.
    4. Support mixed-delivery providers to utilize and customize UPK communication collateral aimed at sharing full-day options with families.
    5. Support mixed-delivery providers to recruit families of at-promise three-year-old children as spaces become available
    6. Other [open response]
15. Did the grantee form a local workgroup in their county to assist in implementation of the activities of this grant as required in statute?
16. Yes
17. No
18. If the grantee answered Yes to question 13, which of the following entities attended a majority of meetings for the working group?

[check all that apply]

1. The County Office(s) of Education
2. School District(s) offering transitional kindergarten
3. Charter schools offering transitional kindergarten
4. Childcare resource and referral programs
5. Alternative Payment programs operating preschool programs
6. First 5 County Commissions
7. Contracted state preschool programs, including both local education

agency and community-based organization programs

1. General childcare programs serving preschool-age children
2. Tribal Nations with Preschool Programs
3. Private center-based childcare serving preschool-age children
4. Licensed family childcare providers
5. Educators
6. Exclusive bargaining representatives
7. Head Start (inclusive of Tribal Head Start, and/or Migrant/Seasonal head Start)
8. Faculty at local institutions of higher education focusing on child

development or early childhood education

1. Early childhood education teacher preparation programs, including institutions of higher education
2. If the grantee answered Yes to questions 13, which of the following entities were you **unable** to receive consistent commitment to the working group?
3. The County Office(s) of Education
4. School District(s) offering transitional kindergarten
5. Charter schools offering transitional kindergarten
6. Childcare resource and referral programs
7. Alternative Payment programs operating preschool programs
8. First 5 County Commissions
9. Contracted state preschool programs, including both local education agency and community-based organization programs
10. General childcare programs serving preschool-age children
11. Tribal Nations with Preschool Programs
12. Private center-based childcare serving preschool-age children
13. Licensed family childcare providers
14. Educators
15. Exclusive bargaining representatives
16. Head Start (inclusive of Tribal Head Start, and/or Migrant/Seasonal head Start)
17. Faculty at local institutions of higher education focusing on child development or early childhood education
18. Early childhood education teacher preparation programs, including institutions of higher education
19. In what ways did the grantee invite the entities listed in question 14 to participate in the working group?
    1. Email
    2. Telephone call
    3. Social media
    4. Other [open response]
20. In which of the following ways are workgroup members able to participate?
    1. We held in person meetings only
    2. We held hybrid meetings with a virtual component
    3. We held meetings virtually only
    4. We held meetings only during regular business hours
    5. We held meetings outside of regular business hours
    6. We recorded meetings and sent recording links to members to elicit feedback
    7. We sent out agendas and requested input prior to meetings
    8. We communicated through email
    9. Other [open response]
21. How often are working group meetings held?
    1. Twice a week
    2. Once a week
    3. Once a month
    4. Every other month
    5. Bimonthly
    6. Other [open response]
22. How many representatives from each entity participated in the working group? [pull down menu of 1-5+ next to each entity]
23. The County Office(s) of Education
24. School District(s) offering transitional kindergarten
25. Charter schools offering transitional kindergarten
26. Childcare resource and referral programs
27. Alternative Payment programs operating preschool programs
28. First 5 County Commissions
29. Contracted state preschool programs, including both local education agency and community-based organization programs
30. General childcare programs serving preschool-age children
31. Tribal Nations with Preschool Programs
32. Private center-based childcare serving preschool-age children
33. Licensed family childcare providers
34. Educators
35. Exclusive bargaining representatives
36. Head Start (inclusive of Tribal Head Start, and/or Migrant/Seasonal head Start)
37. Faculty at local institutions of higher education focusing on child development or early childhood education
38. Early childhood education teacher preparation programs, including institutions of higher education
39. Are the members of the working group only from the grantee’s county or from multiple counties in their region?
    1. Only from the grantee’s county
    2. From multiple counties in the region

#### Focus Area C: Workforce Recruitment and Professional Learning

1. Did the grantee review the County Office of Education plan submitted for the Early Education Teacher Development Grant?
   1. Yes
   2. b. No
2. How does the grantee plan to build onto the plans submitted for the EETD grant to support the recruitment efforts of LEAs needed to implement its UPK Plan (including CSPP teachers, assistant teachers, TK teachers, and TK teachers’ instructional aides and assistants)?
3. [open response]
4. How does the grantee plan to partner with the local Quality Counts California (QCC) to support the workforce development of the mixed delivery system through joint professional learning opportunities, coaching, and other quality improvement activities?
5. [open response]
6. On which of the following does the grantee intend to partner with LEAs to increase supply and capacity of the early learning workforce?
7. Supporting diverse and effective multilingual educators
8. Supporting teachers to earn a PK-3 Specialist Credential
9. Supporting teachers to earn a child development permit
10. Supporting diverse and effective teachers to teach in CSPP
11. Supporting professional development opportunities on any of the following (ASQ, DRDP, DRA, TS GOLD, WSS)
12. Support and work with local and philanthropic partners on apprenticeships
13. Other [open response]
14. What support will you put in place or enhance to assist existing and aspiring UPK staff to receive the required credentials, degrees, or experiences necessary to be promoted into their desired role?
15. Partner with LEAs and other agencies to support professional development offerings
16. Partner with one or more local Institutions of higher education (IHEs) or the COE to help support teachers holding less than a full credential to complete requirements to earn a preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential
17. Partner with LEAs to collaborate on how best to support teachers in applying for credentialing programs or teacher residency grant programs
18. Establish a relationship with local LEAs to support the establishment of pathways for high school students interested in a career in CSPP or in P–3 teaching through clubs, registered apprenticeships, or other such early recruitment opportunities
19. Identify agencies who provide advising on credential requirements and options for how to meet these requirements, and create partnerships with those agencies
20. Partner with local LEAs to provide additional support focused on the recruitment of BIPOC teachers
21. Partner with a local IHE offering eligible early childhood education or childhood development coursework
22. Partner with local LEAs to provide additional support focused on the recruitment of multilingual teachers
23. Partner with local LEAs to provide additional support focused on the recruitment of teachers supporting children with disabilities
24. Partner with LEAs and other agencies to promote professional development opportunities for early learning teachers to support high quality inclusion
25. Partner with Tribal nations who can certify tribal language teachers and tribal cultural teachers
26. Other [open response]
27. How will you assist existing and aspiring UPK site supervisors, teachers, and other support staff in identifying and accessing local workforce pathway programs, including financial support programs?
28. Holding technical assistance session
29. Connecting programs with local workforce development efforts
30. Connecting programs to local QCC efforts
31. Facilitating partnerships with local higher education partners
32. What is the grantee’s plan to establish or strengthen relationships with the Tribal Nations in your county to ensure their participation for workforce development? [open response]

#### Focus Area D: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

1. How will the grantee support providers in the mixed-delivery system to review and assess curriculum for UPK classrooms that aligns with the *California Preschool Learning Foundations* and the *California Preschool Curriculum Frameworks*? For example, providing a list of curricula that align with these resources, reviewing sample lesson plans or daily schedules, classroom observations of learning experiences)?
   * 1. [open response]
   1. How will the grantee support providers in the mixed-delivery system to implement instructional practices to support children with disabilities in UPK (for example, Implementing Universal Design for Learning, providing specialized services in the classroom with peer models, implementing social-emotional strategies such as the Pyramid Model)?
      1. [open response]
   2. How will the grantee create partnerships to support the mixed-delivery system to implement instructional practices that support language, language revitalization, and overall development of multilingual learners? (For example, implementing a bilingual or dual language immersion program, hiring of bilingual staff, in-classroom involvement of parents that speak the home language of children, dedicated time during the daily schedule for individual or small group support with multilingual learners, use of curricula, books, and materials in the home language(s) of children)?
      1. [open response]

#### Focus Area E: Facilities, Services, and Operations

1. How will the grantee support the mixed-delivery system to address facilities issues to support offering extended learning opportunities, including during LEA breaks and summer?
2. [open response]
3. How will the grantee discourage displacement of early learning education programs operated by non-LEA administrators on LEA campuses?
   1. [open response]
4. How will the grantee support the transitioning of programs to serve younger children (or to offer extended learning opportunities, including in intersession and summer)?
   1. [open response]
5. How is the grantee assessing facility needs or supporting local UPK programs to assess facility needs?
   1. Survey of local LEAs and other UPK providers to understand facility needs
   2. Opportunities to address facility needs at public meetings where partners are convened
   3. Review of LEA and COE plans to understand facility needs indicated in those plans
6. How will the grantee connect local programs to facility renovation opportunities to assess and expand on their own facility’s needs?
7. How will the grantee collaborate with Tribal Nations to engage in creating a partnership that may include using tribal facilities to best meet the needs of the community? [open response]

#### Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Questions

The CDE is collecting information on the type(s) and topics of technical assistance that LPCs and R&Rs may need to support the expansion of effective UPK programming in the mixed-delivery system.

The following questions are optional. However, unlike the recommended questions included in Focus Areas A through E, the CDE will be collecting any information that LPCs and R&Rs wish to provide in response to these questions via the survey that the CDE administers to collect the required data questions above.

1. How are the local planning council and resources and referral agencies developing capacity to support UPK? [select all that apply]
2. The grantee has already or will be hiring a dedicated staff person to focus on UPK or P-3
3. Providing technical assistance or coaching on key issues such as braided
4. and blended funding models, curriculum and instruction best practices
5. Facilitating standing capacity building, peer learning, or collaboration meetings
6. Integrating the LEAs and COEs with LPC and R&R UPK planning and implementation efforts
7. Serving as a liaison between LEAs and early education community
8. partners within the mixed-delivery system
9. Holding forums for parents
10. Partnering with other LPCs and R&Rs to increase or share expertise
11. Partnering with the local First 5 county commission
12. Joining UPK or P-3 webinars offered by the CDE
13. Joining trainings or webinars offered by other organizations
14. Creating a local workgroup with entities representing the mixed-delivery
15. System
16. Ongoing collaboration and partnership with Tribal Nations to expand knowledge and understanding of tribal history, current, and future community efforts
17. Other [open response]