2013 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

California

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Annual Performance Report

California

2013

CFDA Number: 84.412
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0713
Expiration Date: December 31, 2016

Table of Contents

APR Cover Sheet **1**

Certification **2**

Executive Summary **3**

Successful State Systems **12**
- Governance Structure 12
- Stakeholder Involvement 16
- Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders 18
- Participating State Agencies 20

High-Quality, Accountable Programs **21**
- Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application) 21
- Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application) 25
- Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) 27
- Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application) 30
- Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application) 33
- Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) 36
- Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) 37
- Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application) 40

Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E) **41**

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes **42**
- Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application) 42
- Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application) 43
- Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) 46

Early Childhood Education Workforce **48**
- Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application) 48
- Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) 54
- Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) 55

Measuring Outcomes and Progress **57**
- Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application) 57

Data Tables **59**
- Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age 59
- Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs 60
- Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age 62
- Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity 63
- Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development 64

Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State 66
Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards 67
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State 68

Budget and Expenditure Tables 69
Budget Summary Table 69
Budget Table: Project 1 – Grants Management 71
Budget Table: Project 2 – Regional Leadership Consortia, Expansion and Related Activities 73
Budget Table: Project 3 – Home Visiting 75
Budget Table: Project 4 – Screening Tool Distribution 77
Budget Table: Project 5 – Curricula Development for Higher Education 79
Budget Table: Project 6 – CSEFEL 81
Budget Table: Project 7 – Licensing Website 83
Budget Table: Project 8 – Linking KEA Data To CALPADS 85
Budget Table: Project 9 – PAS/BAS Training For Mentors 87
Budget Table: Project 10 – Electronic Training Materials On Existing Content 89
Budget Table: Project 11 – Professional Development For Early Start 91
Budget Table: Project 12 – Evaluation 93
Budget Table: Project 13 – Inter-Rater Reilability 95

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 cell 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, CA, 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: 1/1/2013 **to** 12/31/2013

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

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: Early Education and Support Division 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. Nearly 1.9 million (70 percent) of children under five in California are represented by the 16 counties.

In addition, California is using a portion of the RTT-ELC grant funds to make several one-time investments in state capacity via nine 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 and staff members from the Early Education and Support Division (EESD) (formerly called the Child Development Division) and First 5 California (F5CA) serve as the the RTT-ELC Implementation Team that provides overall grant administration, project monitoring, technical assistance (TA), and support for the Consortia.

During the second 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 second year of RTT-ELC by sharing sample documents, providing feedback, and actively

participating in all RTT-ELC work groups [Evaluation, Continuous Quality Improvement Pathways (Pathways), and Rating and Monitoring] convened by the Implementation Team in 2013. A dropbox.com account was established and is managed by the Implementation Team. It includes 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, made significant progress in California's Framework development in operationalizing the three common tiers across all the Consortia by developing an TQRIS Consortia Implementation Guide. In addition, work groups were formed to refine and clarify the Pathways to support site progress on the Hybrid Rating Matrix (Matrix). The Pathways are California's companion piece to the Matrix and together they form the Framework. California developed the Pathways by streamlining the rated elements on its Framework to prioritize research-based tools that demonstrate improved child outcomes. A separate work group was formed to address the Family Engagement Pathway. After a series of presentations and lengthy discussion, the Consortia adopted Strengthening Families as a common approach and added it to the Pathways.

  By the end of 2013, after significant efforts to develop a continuum of activities to support continuous quality improvement, the Consortia adopted the Pathways Core Tools & Resources document with flexibility for local application. There was agreement that specifying a continuum of activities and technical assistance might limit flexibility of each consortium to use the common tools and resources with TA mechanisms that meet local needs and priorities. Thus, the document includes eight Pathways. Each Pathway includes a goal, related Matrix element, the tools identified in the Framework, along with a myriad of additional tools and resources, to support quality improvement and professional development.

- **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 2013 as the Consortia sought input regarding implementation of pilot 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.

  Various 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.

- **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:

> *"The implementation of the QRIS in Orange County has been highly successful in both the internal development and management of a newly designed system of rating and technical assistance serving the RTT-ELC pilot cohort and the development and launch of a community partnership designed to umbrella existing quality improvement programs and align and coordinate services to providers and families across Orange County."*
>
> *- First 5 Orange 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.

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. Many consortia noted most of the tiered program standards on the Matrix (Please refer to Appendix-B of California's 2013 APR attachment) have been in place as part of their F5CA Power of Preschool (PoP) program (now the CSP) or other related quality improvement efforts.

- **QRIS Implementation**

Significant progress was made at the local level in developing local TQRIS databases; engaging sites and launching orientation sessions; conducting program and classroom baseline assessments based on the TQRIS; launching initial training and technical assistance (T&TA); fully integrating local quality improvement and workforce development funding streams; and forging relationships with institutes of higher education, with expanded course offerings being explored.

Every consortium reported moving forward with their local RTT-ELC Action Plans and quickly adapting to the Matrix. They are engaging programs that represent an excellent cross section of the early learning community and prioritizing those serving children with high needs. In 2013, the Consortia also hired and trained coaches and project staff or contracted with other entities to carry out the training, observation, evaluation, or coaching activities.

- **Rating and Monitoring**

  Consortia members worked to build their cadre of trained and reliable assessors in the ERS and CLASS tools. In the interim, baseline ratings were established by verifying all QRIS elements that did not require an independent assessment. The progress made on the Implementation Guide was a significant step in helping the Consortia to clarify site selection, rating criteria, and information that could be used to successfully engage sites and carry out an initial rating. In late 2013, F5CA was invited to begin developing a contract to manage the Assessment Management System to build assessor capacity, ensure reliability, and support overall rating and monitoring across the Consortia.

- **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 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 a Continuous Quality Improvement Plan 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.

- **Staffing**

  In 2013, consortia were better prepared to staff appropriately. 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 consortium's 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 other counties in the use of California's RTT-ELC Framework by joining the established Consortia activities or implementing a local RTT-ELC TQRIS.
  - **Consortia RTT-ELC Action Plans** - Performance measure tables in the original application were updated by the Consortia with target participation in their local RTT-ELC Action Plans. As of the end of December 2013, all 17 consortia had approved RTT-ELC Action Plan tables.
  - **Statewide Investment Projects** - The following have been accomplished:

- Workforce - California Early Childhood Mentor Directors were trained on the Program Administration Scale (PAS) and the Business Administration Scale (BAS). Agreement was reached on common course outlines for the expanded early learning core curricula at California Community Colleges. California Early Childhood Online (CECO) was launched offering online courses on core resources.
- Health - California's Home Visiting Program staff received trainings on infant and toddlers. Training on developmental screening and screening tool sets were provided for local Consortia members.
- Inter-agency Work - The California Department of Developmental Services has been able to support the Consortia's use of developmental screeners and the making of appropriate referrals. F5CA staff became an integral part of the Implementation Team.
- TQRIS - A Request for Proposal for a validation evaluation to study the effectiveness of the Consortia TQRIS was released, applications were scored, and a contract awarded to American Institutes for Research (AIR).

Lessons Learned

- **TQRIS**

The most significant planning lesson learned to date has been that “less is more” and the importance of limiting the number of items assessed in a TQRIS in order to avoid creating a confusing and cumbersome system. This lesson learned continued to resonate in 2013 as Consortia recruited sites and developed TA plans. “Less is more” helped to center the Pathways work group recommendations and was confirmed repeatedly in conversations about continuous quality improvement.

Flexibility and patience continued to be crucial in the second 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 the desire to be responsive while remaining flexible and the importance of 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 funding possibilities. Consortia weighed this principle carefully when implementation challenges arose and modifications were recommended.

As the Consortia began recruiting and working with programs, 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 development 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 as more than a rating)

Furthermore, although the portfolio model of verifying most ratings is a hallmark of a high quality, efficient QRIS but not as easily implemented. It 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.

- **Rating and Monitoring**

Recruiting and contracting with external, reliable assessors was more challenging than anticipated, and those who expressed interest were rarely qualified at the levels required. Becoming "reliable" takes more time and commitment on the part of assessors than expected, and the cost of training an adequate number of reliable assessors is daunting. The Consortia began discussing ways to share assessor resources, a lesson learned in efficiency.

- **Continuous Quality Improvement**

It is imperative there be a "clear firewall" between coaches and assessors; coaches must be trained to deliver the results of assessment.

> *"Creating a culture of continuous quality improvement is emotional and complicated work. Communicating quality rating data, such as ERS and CLASS scores, requires tact and sensitivity. Both family child care providers and center administrators often take these results personally and low scores are viewed as a direct reflection of their work."*
>
> *- Los Angeles County Office of Child Care*

- **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 the second year of 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, is important to the sustainability of a QRIS.

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 began developing 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 TQRIS implementation nationwide 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 has 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.

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 2012 regarding the time involved in Consortia decision-making, implementation agreements continued to be a time-consuming process.

  Strategies:

  The Implementation Team utilized past experience to more realistically plan meetings, agendas, and communicate with the Consortia. Furthermore, in October 2013, the Implementation Team developed a document clarifying work group membership, communication responsibilities, and the decision-making process, while also developing a tracking system for those decisions made.

- **Program Participation**

  Although most consortia reported success in recruiting programs to the TQRIS, some consortia continued to experience challenges in recruiting participant sites. Some challenges in recruiting included dissatisfaction by some programs that felt the elements of the Matrix did not reflect their pedagogy (e.g., Montessori) or felt some elements were missing (e.g., explicit acknowledgment of sites that include children with special needs). In addition, due to under-enrollment of family child care providers, the Consortia struggled to reconcile the expenditures for assessment and coaching with relatively few number of children served.

  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. Some consortia reported that not all participating sites had fully invested in the coaching process.

  Strategies:

  Some consortia found that conducting an initial interview with sites helped programs to understand the benefits and challenges of participating in TQRIS. As a result, some consortia adjusted their incentives to gain commitment earlier in the process.

- **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 2013 was the difficulty in finding enough reliable, independent assessors needed to complete the ERS and the CLASS

assessments. The cost of training, coupled with a lack of access to reliable trainers and assessors, made scaling-up difficult.

> *"Along with our colleagues from other counties, we share the challenge of insufficient assessor capacity and the prohibitive cost of assessor calibration and anchoring. The assessor cost/capacity challenge threatens sustainability."*
>
> *- First 5 Alameda*

The development of local databases and finalization of common data elements also was challenging for many consortia. Several consortia reported that selecting and implementing an adequate database to track information required by the state and local evaluation was difficult due to infrastructure, lack of flexibility, and training. Consortia share information to better learn from each other and in several cases, are developing shared regional databases to maximize efficiencies and share costs. During 2013, the Consortia worked to identify the common data elements which caused some friction as local consortia developed and implemented data systems prior to determination of the final common data elements.

Strategies:

The Implementation Team conducted a survey to determine each consortium's assessor capacity. Based on those survey results, some consortia partnered with each other to gain access to reliable assessors. Several consortia adopted the Implementation Team's recommended to assign an entry level pre-assessment rating as a bridge to full assessment and rating. This allows consortia to spend more time on the "continuous quality improvement" aspect of TQRIS before rating sites.

- **Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Process**

The work group process for developing the Pathways slowed progress in establishing local TA plans. While significant progress was made in finalizing the Rating and Monitoring Implementation Guide, balancing local flexibility with standardization caused its own set of challenges. The Rating and Monitoring work group met regularly to make, confirm, or revisit common implementation agreements causing the Consortia to adapt as decisions were made or revised.

Implementation of some QRIS CQI activities was delayed due to difficulty in hiring qualified coaches due to availability or county hiring restrictions. Although many consortia collaborated with partner agencies to share coaching responsibilities, several consortia experienced challenges in creating supports for training and supervision, and maintaining standards of quality across these different agencies.

There were also challenges in building the capacity of training opportunities that support the CQI process, such as the ERS, CLASS certification, Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP), and the California Collaborative for the Social-Emotional Foundations of Early Learning (CSEFEL). Many consortia 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:

Patience and flexibility went a long way in helping to manage delays and stumbling blocks in the development of the Pathways. At the local level, ensuring strong partnerships with professional development stakeholders across the service delivery system was essential to building a foundation for successful CQI implementation.

- **Consortia Staffing and Contracts**

Many consortia stated they have experienced delays in implementing their RTT-ELC pilot as they build their teams and search for qualified staff. Some struggled with hiring freezes and staffing restrictions and needed to use existing staffing to support planning, coordination, and various tasks for TQRIS implementation. The amount of time needed to execute contracts created another added layer to staff workload and contributed to program implementation delays. 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 Implementation Team expanded the Inter-Rater Reliability contract to support 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).

The governance structure for California's RTT-ELC grant continues to function as illustrated by the organizational chart in California's RTT-ELC application (Please refer to Appendix-A of California's 2013 APR attachment). This structure was established to build on California's strong tradition of inter-agency collaboration and governance. Through the RTT-ELC grant, this tradition has been strengthened and enhanced by more opportunities to collaborate and maximize the expertise and resources of the various state agencies participating in the grant. Communication channels have been established at all levels of the structure to ensure agencies are kept apprised of RTT-ELC grant activities and major developments, including all Consortia meetings and issues. The following sections describe the major organizational levels and discuss 2013 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 (DOF, CDSS, and SBE) continued to be involved in major policy issues pertaining to RTT-ELC. In 2013, in addition to receiving periodic updates, they focused particularly on the use of the RTT-ELC Supplemental Award and how to disburse funds for statewide activities and to the Consortia. They established policy direction on how the Consortia were to use these additional funds, namely to increase the number of sites serving young children with high needs and to provide mentoring services to counties not participating in the RTT-ELC grant. The goal of mentoring non-Consortia counties is to assist them in improving quality of their early childhood programs by learning about, and possibly implementing, the Quality Continuum Framework (Framework).

During 2013, changes occurred within the leadership of CDE's EESD. In December 2012, the EESD director, Camille Maben, who served as the grant project director, became Executive Director of F5CA. This resulted in having an interim grant project director for several months until a new EESD director was appointed. In September 2013, Debra McMannis became EESD's director and assumed the role of grant project director. Ms. McMannis, along with Camille Maben and Cecelia Fisher-Dahms, Administrator for the EESD's Quality Improvement Office, who serves as the current project lead for the RTT-ELC Implementation Team, met on a bi-weekly basis to assure effective coordination and implementation of the grant.

In her new position, Ms. Maben continued to strongly support the RTT-ELC grant by overseeing policy direction and implementation progress. By maintaining an active role, Ms. Maben models one of the RTT-ELC grant's main goals - coordination and partnerships across Participating State Agencies (PSAs). In addition, Ms. Maben provided F5CA staff and other resources to assist in the grant's implementation, resulting in a strong partnership between the CDE and F5CA, and increasing the coordination and alignment of several of their joint projects and

programs. While the grant's fiscal and administrative management remains with CDE, F5CA brought, and will continue to bring, additional resources and staff expertise to assist in the implementation of the grant.

State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care (SAC)

During 2013, California's State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care (SAC) actively met in January, May, and September. The SAC is co-chaired by representatives from the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and CDE and has twelve members representing a broad range of state and local agencies and organizations with a stake in the early childhood field, including social services, health and mental health, and higher education. Two of the governor-appointed members are also leaders in the Consortia. The SAC meetings allowed for RTT-ELC updates and provided an opportunity for feedback from the SAC members to RTT-ELC representatives. Maintaining this connection between RTT-ELC and the SAC is of key importance.

Throughout the year, the SAC devoted the majority of its time overseeing the development, and ultimately final approval, of *California's Comprehensive Early Learning Plan* that identifies four key, interrelated system drivers: 1.) Access to Quality Early Learning and Care; 2.) Program-Level Continuous Improvement; 3.) A Great Early Childhood Workforce; and 4.) Family Partnership, and six essential elements: 1.) Assessing and Meeting the Needs of Children; 2.) Supporting Dual Language Learners; 3.) Effective Data Practices; 4.) Food, Nutrition, and Physical Activity; 5.) Kindergarten Transition; and 6.) Finance and Governance. For the full report, go to: http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/. Another major area of focus for the SAC was overseeing its projects, many of which support California's RTT-ELC grant and were funded with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds.

RTT-ELC Implementation Team

As the lead agency, the CDE continued to rely on the Implementation Team consisting of staff from EESD and F5CA to carry out the day-to-day administration of the grant. The tasks included ensuring all federal reporting requirements were met and supported the work of the Integrated Action Team, the Consortia, and the portion of the SAC's work dedicated to RTT-ELC activities. In addition, the Implementation Team developed, awarded, and/or monitored, ten contracts or inter-agency agreements related to grant projects and ensured scopes of work were updated in the federal database.

The largest portion of the team's work was supporting the Consortia. This included facilitating five Consortia in-person meetings and one conference call, and numerous in-person or webinar work group sessions; serving as Consortia liaisons in assisting the Consortia with grant implementation at the local level; developing grant award agreements and report templates; reviewing Action Plans, Action Plan amendments, budget plans and expenditure reports, and Annual Performance Reports; monitoring; and providing T&TA.

In addition to the ongoing tasks listed above, the Implementation Team accomplished the following major activities in 2013:

- **Consortia Work Groups** - Launched two new work groups (Pathways and Family Engagement) and continued facilitating the Rating and Monitoring and Evaluation work groups. These work groups delved deeply into the assigned topic by conducting review of the research and best practices and developing recommendations to make to the entire Consortia for adoption at a Consortia meeting. The make-up of the work groups comprised of representatives from each consortium, content experts, practitioners, and

PSA representatives, and parent groups where appropriate. The results and/or actions of these work groups are described in appropriate sections of this report.

- **Evaluation Contract** - Developed and awarded a contract to an independent evaluator to conduct the validation and effectiveness study of California's Framework, with a focus on the three common tiers across each consortium's TQRIS. The Evaluation work group fulfilled an instrumental role in providing input to the evaluation design questions and data collection elements.

- **Inter-rater Reliability Contract** - Initiated a new interagency agreement with RTT-ELC Supplemental Award funds to establish a statewide cadre of reliable raters that meet the various criteria for the ERS and the CLASS. The agreement will be finalized in early 2014.

- **Consortia On-Site Visits** - Developed on-site visitation and monitoring protocol, and conducted on-site visits by the Implementation Team liaisons to most of the Consortia.

- **RTT-ELC Supplemental Funds Award** - Developed the proposed policy direction and methodology for awarding these new funds and conferred with the Governor's Office and Administration, especially the DOF and the SBE, seeking their approval. The supplemental funds were approved for use as follows: (1) increased funding to the Consortia that agreed to serve a required number of children with high needs as stipulated by the Administration and reach out to actively mentor neighboring non RTT-ELC counties; (2) increased funding for the independent evaluation; (3) allocated funding for the Inter-rater Reliability contract; (4) allocated funding to purchase additional developmental screening tools for use by Consortia providers; and (5) established authority for limited-term staff positions within EESD to support RTT-ELC implementation.

  With the award of new funds to the Consortia, the Implementation Team established the process to allocate these funds according to the Administration's direction. This entailed developing criteria and guidance for use of these funds; determining each consortium's funding allocations; reviewing and approving the Consortia revised action plans; and distributing revised Grant Award Notifications to the Consortia.

  The funding approval also included the hiring of two consultant positions and one support position, all limited-term for the life of the grant, to complement the Implementation Team. The personnel paperwork was prepared and approved to establish these positions. They were advertised at the end of 2013 and will be hired in early 2014. In addition, all of the necessary reports and budget information pertaining to the RTT-ELC Supplemental Award were submitted to the appropriate federal agencies.

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 is largely dependent on the performance of the 17 Consortia in 16 counties. California's TQRIS is driven by local efforts as developed and decided by the Consortia in 2012, including the three common tiers. This past year, the Consortia, with facilitation from the Implementation Team and guidance from the Rating and Monitoring work group, refined the TQRIS and began rating their recruited local early learning programs. The Consortia received major support from the Implementation Team in guiding them in meeting this grant's major goal.

The Consortia includes the following:

California County	Administering Agency
Alameda County	First 5 Alameda
Contra Costa County	First 5 Contra Costa
El Dorado County	First 5 El Dorado
Fresno County	Fresno County Office of Education
Los Angeles County	Los Angeles County Office of Child Care
Los Angeles County	Los Angeles Universal Preschool
Merced County	Merced County Office of Education
Orange County	Orange County Office of Education
Sacramento County	Sacramento County Office of Education
San Diego County	First 5 San Diego
San Francisco County	First 5 San Francisco
San Joaquin County	First 5 San Joaquin
Santa Barbara County	First 5 Santa Barbara
Santa Clara County	First 5 Santa Clara
Ventura County	First 5 Ventura
Yolo County	First 5 Yolo

Throughout 2013, the Consortia met five times via in-person meetings and a conference call. Each consortium sent two to three members to meetings. These meetings and calls focused on grant goals and achieving consensus on the recommended refinements from the Rating and Monitoring work group on the three common tiers across the TQRIS, reviewing and approving recommendations from the Evaluation, Pathways, and Family Engagement work groups; receiving federal and state updates; and sharing information, practices, and resources among the Consortia members.

At the local level, each consortium met with local stakeholders (see Stakeholder Involvement below) and used these meetings as both a way to share federal and state information, and to gather local ideas and feedback to provide information to the Implementation Team.

While each consortium is independent and has a separate grant award agreement with the CDE, the Consortia is also working regionally. The counties surrounding the Greater Sacramento Region and the San Francisco Bay Area formed into two regions in 2012. In 2013, the six counties in Southern California also established a regional approach to share resources and information.

Early Learning Challenge Integrated Action Team (IAT)

The Integrated Action Team consists of representatives from 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.

The IAT meetings were held on June 20 and October 14, 2013. The June meeting focused on establishing the IAT's organizational structure, namely discussing the purpose, goal, communication channels, meeting protocol, and roles of the various IAT participants. In addition, a Webinar on *Implementation Science of Achieving Socially Significant Early Learning Outcomes* was presented. For the remainder of the meeting, the participants brainstormed on what they envisioned the IAT's scope of work should entail for the life of the grant.

At the October meeting, a presentation on California's Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (CECCS) grant was given by the Chief of the California Home Visiting Program Branch, California Department of Public Health. The IAT also serves as a strong partner and advisory body to this grant, thus fostering streamlining and aligning statewide systems and programs.

The October meeting also resulted in the IAT finalizing its goal statement and determining the priority areas for the scope of work and defining each area's short-term, mid-range, and long-term objectives to accomplish for the life of the grant. The goal statement was defined as:

"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."

The adopted priority areas were:

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 Site-level Assessment Tools (e.g. ERS and CLASS™) - ***Program Focus***

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.

In California, there are numerous organizations, professional associations, foundations, state agencies, legislative groups, and general interested parties all involved and/or concerned about early learning programs/initiatives for young children. Keeping them all informed of early learning efforts is an ongoing challenge. Effective communication is an essential component in reaching all of these diverse groups. The RTT-ELC grant is one initiative that has generated significant interest among these groups. It required the Implementation Team to develop several communication strategies to maintain ongoing information-sharing and opportunities for involvement that potentially would lead to assistance in sustaining the RTT-ELC effort once the grant funding ends.

The communication strategies entail a variety of approaches as follows:

1. Develop a RTT-ELC fact sheet for mass distribution.
2. Establish a RTT-ELC Web page located on the California Department of Education's Web site.
3. Schedule periodic general meetings with stakeholders, partners, and interested parties with the purpose of providing RTT-ELC updates, success stories, and lessons learned thus far.
4. Participate in ongoing/routine partner and state agency meetings and having a standing RTT-ELC component on the agendas.
5. Present speeches and/or workshop sessions at professional association conferences.
6. Invite appropriate stakeholders and partners to serve as resource members to the Consortia work groups.
7. Facilitate IAT meetings comprised of participating state agency representatives and Consortia members (these meetings were discussed in the previous section, Successful State Systems, under the sub-heading Early Learning Challenge Integrated Action Team (IAT).
8. Facilitate regularly scheduled meetings with the 17 Consortia.

At the state level, communication and engagement of all of the above mentioned groups is one of the Implementation Team's main focuses. To achieve this focus, the Implementation Team is actively implementing the identified strategies. Examples of the team's implementation activities are described in the following paragraphs.

Through a grant funded by the Birth to Five Policy Alliance (Alliance), a California team of advocates communicated regularly with the Implementation Team. Working together with the Implementation Team, they updated and re-disseminated the California RTT-ELC Fact Sheet that included the supplemental award information (*please refer to the Fact Sheet in Appendix-D of California's 2013 APR attachment*). The Implementation Team also worked with the advocates to access TA from national partners. Through this, a team member attended the Alliance Annual Meeting where she presented in a session covering the advocacy role in states to support the RTT-ELC system building efforts and provided highlights of California's design and implementation status to date.

In order to engage a wider group of stakeholders across the state, the Implementation Team convened a meeting on January 30, 2013. This meeting provided background and an update on RTT-ELC, as well as highlights of the work being done locally by consortia. The meeting was open to the public and also video web streaming. Attendees included legislative staff, advocacy organizations, quality improvement projects funded through Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), state agencies, federal program partners, and related professional associations. Other RTT-ELC engagement included specific visits to the Legislature, as well as testifying at several Legislative Hearings in the spring and presenting to the F5CA State Commission.

As a broader way to engage stakeholders and ensure others were informed of the RTT-ELC grant efforts and status, the Implementation Team worked to ensure RTT-ELC became a standing component of partner meetings. Updates and highlights on California's RTT-ELC grant were included as agenda topics in other major meetings, including the SAC Meetings, State Interagency Team/California Home Visiting Program, the Statewide Screening Collaborative, California State-Tribes Collaboration Meetings, Strengthening Families Statewide Round Table, Water Cooler, and other state level meetings.

The members of the Implementation Team, along with Consortia representatives, also presented at multiple conferences and included discussion sections to ensure stakeholder feedback. These conferences included the California Child Development Administrators Association Fall Technical Assistance and Statewide Membership Meeting, the California Head Start Association Policy Summit, the California Child Care Resource & Referral Network and the California Alternative Payment Program Association 2013 Annual Conference, the Curriculum & Instruction Steering Committee of the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association Leadership Symposium, and a conference on Home Visiting. The major topics presented included: 1.) TQRIS in California: Implementation of RTT-ELC through 17 Local Regional Consortia; and 2.) RTT-ELC as a Quality Improvement Umbrella: Leveraging and Aligning with Other Efforts at the State and Local Level.

In addition, the Consortia work groups made concerted efforts to invite appropriate PSA representatives, content experts, practitioners, parent representatives, and key stakeholders to serve as resource members to the work groups. Having their expertise and perspectives aided the Consortia representatives in developing the recommendations that were eventually forwarded to the Consortia for action.

At the local level, the Consortia were also committed to engaging stakeholders and partners in county-wide RTT-ELC policy issues and activities. Effective strategies were employed by the Consortia to engage these groups that consist of representation from higher education, child care resource and referral agencies, LPCs, health and human service agencies, home visiting, Head Start/Early Head Start, county offices of education, school districts, First 5 county commissions, community service organizations, private child care providers, tribal and migrant representatives, parents, and members of the business community.

The Consortia engaged local stakeholders in the following ways:

- Conducted key informant interviews and surveys (76 percent of Consortia)
- Established a permanent Advisory Group (76 percent)
- Integrated TQRIS requirements into an existing memorandum of understanding and agreements for quality improvement work (71 percent)
- Held regional meetings (65 percent)
- Established additional work groups (65 percent)
- Employed other engagement strategies, such as parent surveys/focus groups; used communications strategies, such as web sites and social media campaigns; targeted outreach to specific types of providers, such as family child care homes (24 percent)

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.

The California State Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-14 offered optimism for the first time in several years. Unlike past years, the programs administered by the EESD were not reduced. Instead, there was a small increase to some early learning programs with a more substantial increase to the California State Preschool Program.

The Legislature enacted a $10 million increase as follows:

- $7 million for the General Child Care and Development Programs
- $2.6 million for the low-income Alternative Payment Program
- $400,000 for the Migrant Center Program

In addition to the above, the Legislature and Governor added $25 million to the California State Preschool Program for the purpose of providing part-day, part-year services this fiscal year to existing State Preschool Program contractors. Some children who lost services due to federal sequestration were able to be served by this increase in funding.

With these funding increases, California was able to maintain its current number of contracted programs and did not experience a significant decrease in program services that occurred in past years. Consequently, local programs were more receptive to participating in the RTT-ELC grant.

Through the Budget Act, the CDE was also charged with the development of a plan to provide universal preschool to all children the year before kindergarten, due April 1, 2014. The budget had contained funding to staff this effort, but that funding was vetoed by the Governor, who indicated that this was not the time to develop such a plan. While the funding was vetoed, the requirement for the plan remains.

Besides the above Budget Act provisions, several other legislative bills were enacted that impacted early learning programs. California Senate Bill 1016 pertains to the family fee schedule used in all of CDE's early learning programs. The EESD was charged with developing a new family fee schedule that is simple and easy to implement. This new schedule is to be cost neutral to the state and generate roughly the same amount of revenue. The EESD worked closely (and will continue to do so) with a group of stakeholders to determine the best alternative and provide recommendations to the DOF in early 2014. Stakeholders have reported that the biggest deterrent to continued enrollment is a family's inability to pay family fees.

Another enacted bill, California Assembly Bill 290, requires nutrition training as a condition for licensing. For licenses issued on or after January 1, 2016, this bill requires that at least one director or teacher at each day care center, and each family day care home licensee who provides care, have childhood nutrition training as part of the preventive health practices course or courses. Instruction in childhood nutrition must be at least one hour in length and must include content on age-appropriate meal patterns based on the most current Dietary Guidelines for Americans. In order to increase child care providers' capacity to serve healthy foods at a lower cost, the training shall contain information about reimbursement rates for the United States Department of Agriculture's Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP).

While the above bills impact the management of early learning programs at the state and local levels, they will not require California's RTT-ELC State Plan to be amended. These bills deal primarily with technical changes that ease the administrative burden of operating early learning programs, the exception being AB 290, which adds a nutritional training requirement for providers.

For the Budget Act provision that requires a universal preschool plan for all children the year before kindergarten, the EESD may be able to reflect the experiences of improving quality of early learning programs gleaned from the RTT-ELC grant in this plan.

Participating State Agencies

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

California's five PSAs [CDSS, Department of Developmental Services (CDDS) , Department of Public Health (CDPH), F5CA, the State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care (SAC), and SBE] continued their involvement in the RTT-ELC grant as defined in their scopes of work. As mentioned above in the Governance Section, F5CA's RTT-ELC commitment increased this year by having the agency's staff become actively engaged in working on major aspects of the Consortia implementation. The other PSAs made steady progress in meeting their commitments as stated in their scopes of work. The CDSS amended its approach to implementing its scope of work and is in the final stages of completing a contract, which will commence in early 2014.

A PSA meeting was held in April 2013 and included a status report of RTT-ELC implementation, an update on Consortia activities and the one-time statewide investment projects, and sharing of the state agency's progress. Sharing progress was an essential part of the meeting as each state agency explained its activities and how it supported the goals of RTT-ELC. During the interactive discussion, the PSAs began identifying issues and strategies to strengthen interagency coordination, streamline the decision-making process, and effectively allocate resources to the targeted RTT-ELC population. The meeting concluded with PSA representatives understanding that their involvement in future meetings would be through the IAT meetings and their interaction with Consortia members. Please refer to the above section on the IAT for information about additional meetings.

PCA representatives also served as key resource experts to the various Consortia work groups. For example, representatives from several units within the CDSS actively participated in the Rating and Monitoring (Licensing Unit), Pathways (Licensing Unit), and Family Engagement (Office of Child Abuse Prevention) work groups. Through these interactions, the EESD was invited to send a representative to participate as an official member on CDSS's Strengthening Families Steering Committee and Round Table.

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 2013, California continued to implement the Matrix 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 Matrix includes three common tiers across the Consortia and common point values for each of the seven rated elements (in center-based sites - Child Observation, Developmental and Health Screenings, Minimum Qualifications for Lead Teacher/Family Child Care Home, Effective Teacher-Child Interactions, Ratios and Group Size, Program Environment Rating Scales, and Director Qualifications). This unique system allows for local differences rather than mandating a one-size-fits-all system throughout such a diverse state.

A Rating and Monitoring Work group, consisting of Consortia members, experts, practitioners, and Implementation Team staff, served as the primary vehicle for examining issues and making recommendations on changes to the Matrix. Two substantive changes were made to the Matrix. The first was to add cut-off scores for the CLASS Toddler at the 4- and 5-point values. These scores were not an intentional omission, but rather an oversight when the Matrix was first designed. The CLASS Toddler scores parallel the cut-off scores that were previously set for the CLASS Pre-K. Teachstone was consulted and cut-off scores were research-based. Recommended scores were presented by the Rating and Monitoring work group and approved by the Consortia. Additionally, the ratio and group size for preschool classrooms was altered slightly at the 5-point value. Originally, it was set at 3:20, but this proved challenging for assessors to rate in some classrooms. The ratio and group size were separated and set at 1:8, with a group size of no more than 20.

The Pathways are California's companion piece to the Matrix and together they form the Framework. California developed the Pathways by streamlining the rated elements on their Framework to prioritize research-based tools that demonstrate improved child outcomes (e.g., the CLASS). The elements from the Framework removed from the Matrix, moved into the Pathways to become part of the participating early learning program's quality improvement plan and each consortium's continuous program improvement process. This allowed the Consortia to narrow the TQRIS focus on the “R” (Rating) and still have resources to dedicate to the corresponding “I” for improvement. Tools and resources included in the Pathways are also grouped into the same three core areas as the Matrix.

California also created a Pathways work group consisting of Consortia members, experts, practitioners, and Implementation Team staff to refine and recommend a finalized Pathways document. The Pathways document addresses eight areas: School Readiness, Social-Emotional Development, Health, Nutrition and Physical Activity, Effective Teacher-Child Interactions, Professional Development, Environment, Program Administration, and Family Engagement. Each area includes a goal (or pathway) related elements from the Matrix, and core tools and resources. In December 2013, the Pathways work group presented the finalized format for the Pathways and complete list of required tools and recommended resources. The document was approved in its entirety by the Consortia.

Significant work was done in 2013 to further define the Family Engagement Pathway. In California's RTT-ELC application, the Framework outlined the Family Engagement element indicating the use of the ERS as the common tools and resources for this element. It further provided the rationale for Family Engagement by stating that "Linguistically and culturally sensitive family engagement strategies promote and enhance the parent/child relationship, provide parents with information about their child's growth and development, and encourage parents' involvement and advocacy in the education at their child's school." In March 2013, the Consortia established a Family Engagement work group to design a Family Engagement pathway that achieves these values and supports the Framework's rationale.

After extensive research, review of best practices, several presentations, and lengthy meeting discussions, the work group offered the following recommendations to the Consortia, which were ultimately adopted at the Consortia's October meeting:

- Goal for the Family Engagement Pathway: Families receive family-centered, intentional supports framed by the Strengthening Families™ Protective Factors to promote family resilience and optimal development of their children.
- RTT-ELC Core Tool and Resource for Family Engagement: Strengthening Families™ Five Protective Factors.

The work group also developed a four-step professional development pathway which established a progressive continuum that: (1) starts with learning about the Strengthening Families™ Five Protective Factors framework family-centered practices, terminology, and tools available to support families; (2) develops a deeper understanding of how relationships with and between families and program quality are inter-related; (3) builds competency by using the Strengthening Families™ Five Protective Factors framework to plan daily interactions with children and families to promote optimal outcomes for children; and (4) consistently integrates Strengthening Families™ Five Protective Factors framework/family-centered practices in all program policies and activities with families fully and meaningfully engaged. At the October 2013 Consortia meeting, the Consortia accepted the work group's recommendation to refer this four-step pathway to a Professional Learning Communities that will commence in 2014.

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 2013, some consortia still struggled with site participation due to fluctuating enrollment in early learning and development programs, program closures, and the complexity of quality improvement work. In order to address these challenges, the Implementation Team and the Consortia continued to collaborate to develop program participation strategies. First, an Implementation Team Liaison was assigned to each consortium to help them address the challenges faced in implementing the TQRIS, including promoting participation. Throughout 2013, the liaisons conducted site visits in Consortia counties where they gained firsthand information about the challenges and successes in recruiting and retaining participant programs.

As mentioned, the Implementation Team continued to facilitate a Rating and Monitoring work group comprised of Consortia representatives as well as state level stakeholders. This work group met regularly to address barriers to implementing the program, which often related to simplifying materials, making the requirements easier to understand, and ensuring consistency of its message. Moreover, a practice-policy feedback loop to the Implementation Team allowed implementation issues, such as those related to the three common tiers in the Matrix, to be quickly addressed and vetted by the whole Consortia.

At the local level, each consortium employed a variety of strategies to ensure measurable progress in TQRIS participating sites. All consortia focused on creating an easily accessible and streamlined program that seeks to make participation a positive experience, and strives to engage and outreach to sites using trusted staff with established relationships with local providers. Consortia members attributed their success in promoting participation to having established quality support systems, partnering with other quality improvement efforts, or responding quickly to participation barriers. For example, by including Head Start and EESD-contracted direct service subsidized programs (Title 5) in the local consortia, they better understood and quickly addressed barriers to participation. As a result of this strategy, several consortia reported significant increases in the number of representatives from Head Start and Title 5 programs participating in their local QRIS. This also provided a mechanism for local input, which was bubbled up to the Implementation Team and the Rating and Monitoring work group.

In addition, Consortia members developed communication materials to inform stakeholder parents and community members about TQRIS, and many developed websites as well. As the publicity around TQRIS became more prominent throughout the year, promoting participation became easier. For example, one consortium explained:

> *"Our ability to meet and exceed our recruitment goals in a short period of time is a testament to our existing reputation as a leader in QRIS implementation in LA County, evidence of our existing infrastructure and expertise in developing effective outreach strategies in the field of early care and education."*
>
> *- Los Angeles County Office of Child Care*

The Consortia also used the following strategies at the local level:

- Incentives for site participation and individual participation. Some consortia offered monetary incentives to sites and to individuals (to assist with the cost of textbooks, reimbursement for “lost wages” for their student teaching, course stipends, etc.). Monetary incentives for sites are typically based on a tiered rating and support the site's quality improvement plan. Consortia who did not provide stipends offered free training, coaching, and resources to individuals and sites to create incentive for participation in a QRIS.
- Partnership with workforce support and professional development programs, including leveraging existing state-funded programs. Statewide programs include F5CA's CARES Plus and EESD's AB 212 (for staff working in state-funded programs). These programs provide professional development and stipends for degree attainment. Some consortia also funded local professional development programs and cohorts for Associate and Bachelor degree attainment, general education, or Early Childhood Education (ECE) content areas.
- Research-based professional development and coaching practices, including Web-based training options and resources.
- Achievement awards for programs reaching tier thresholds (determined locally).
- Non-monetary incentives such as free advertising of their programs on the local TQRIS Web site, including a program directory that highlights quality levels to parents.
- Targeted outreach to program types that are often harder to engage, such as private and Family Child Care Home (FCCH) providers.
- Targeted outreach to hard-to-reach, high need communities.
- Community engagement through presentations to local organizations and distribution of marketing materials.
- Expanded a locally-funded quality improvement initiative to support an increase of early learning and development programs achieving higher levels of quality.

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									

[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	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								

[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.

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.

California has faced several challenges in recruiting and rating sites into the TQRIS, as described in this report's Executive Summary and the High-Quality, Accountable Programs sections. California is making progress in addressing and mitigating the barriers to meeting the targets and expects to reach targets identified for 2014 and 2015.

The initial efforts of the Consortia were focused on California State Preschool and Early Head Start/Head Start. It is expected that Consortia will outreach to programs receiving CCDF funds in the coming years.

In the beginning, California's school districts focused Title I funds only in the K-12 system as a remedial approach for upper elementary grades. With brain research indicating the importance of early education, school administrators are beginning to use Title I funds for preschools as a preventative measure in helping children with high-need acquire skills for school readiness. For this reason, California's Title I funded participating site counts are a low percentage to the total. California is in transition to a local control funding formula for school districts which will provide an opportunity to engage school administrators on the importance of using Title I

funding for preschool. The California Implementation Team will explore with Consortia leadership how to further engage school administrators on how to participate in RTT-ELC.

Regarding sites funded with IDEA Part B and Part C, those numbers are expected to remain low as more of the Consortia's efforts are focused on inclusive early learning settings.

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.

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. The Rating and Monitoring work group expanded on and finalized the Implementation Guide. 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.

As part of state-level coordination, the development of elements for an Inter-rater Reliability contract was developed. 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. Much of 2013 was spent further developing this concept including a scope of work for a contract between the CDE and F5CA, which will be launched in 2014. 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 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 (15 consortia)
  - Coordinated regional assessors (11 consortia)
  - Shared reliable assessors across consortia, including those from other local quality initiatives and programs, such as Head Start (10 consortia)
  - Developed a contract with other entities such as a public universities or LPCs for RTT-ELC quality rating services (5 consortia)

- 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 structure, and director qualifications). Participating programs receive a rating based on the assessment and a corresponding Quality Improvement Plan. The local consortia then provide T&TA along a quality improvement pathway to support the program in achieving higher quality. All consortia report that they develop site-level Continuous Quality Improvement Plans and 65 percent of consortia also develop individual teacher-level Professional Growth Plans. The majority of the Consortia focused on ERS and CLASS scores to develop site-level Quality Improvement Plans.

  Ongoing inter-rater reliability in all consortia was established by the Rating and Monitoring work group at 85 percent using the guidelines set by developers of the utilized rating tools (ERS and CLASS). The Consortia is also encouraged to establish anchors in a consortium or region at 90 percent reliability to ensure ongoing quality control. User-friendly assessment report formats and support materials have been developed for TQRIS participants to further ensure their understanding of the overall rating process. The previously mentioned Inter-rater Reliability contract also will help to ensure ongoing quality control through the development of ongoing reliability/calibration standards (CLASS and ERS) which will occur at a minimum one time per tool (total of six tools) throughout the life of the grant.

- 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, 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. As of the end of 2013, six consortia (Contra Costa, Fresno, Merced, San Diego, San Francisco, and Santa Clara) had purchased a new data system, while another six (Alameda, Orange, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Santa Barbara, Yolo) were still in the purchasing process. El Dorado and Los Angeles Office of Child Care were able to incorporate RTT-ELC data into an existing QRIS database within their counties and others incorporated RTT-ELC TQRIS data into an existing non-QRIS database (Los Angeles Universal Preschool and Ventura).

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

Consortia have not yet publicized site quality ratings to parents, although individual participating sites may have chosen to do so. As the Consortia enrolled and rated larger numbers of sites, they continued to develop materials and strategies for communication with parents. Multiple consortia created certificates for eventual posting onsite while many others are working with providers on how to deliver quality rating information to families. Some consortia are also creating family-friendly materials for distribution.

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 in 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	77	3	38	3	12	18	15
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	5	2	0	0	0	2	0

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

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 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, while most decided to use point values.

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 (DCLA) 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 Family Strengthening protective factors related to social and emotional competence of children.
- National accreditation requirement.
- Additional requirements at the top tier to align with existing quality programs, including F5CA's CSP and Head Start.

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**
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	49	475	1,173	1,664	2,466	475	1,042
Number of Programs in Tier 1	14	231	146	190	115	231	177
Number of Programs in Tier 2	2	50	298	371	301	50	237
Number of Programs in Tier 3	26	186	514	684	940	186	349
Number of Programs in Tier 4	5	6	175	310	828	6	252
Number of Programs in Tier 5	2	2	32	109	282	2	27

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.

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.*

California has faced several challenges in recruiting and rating sites into the TQRIS, as described in this report's Executive Summary and the High-Quality, Accountable Programs sections. California is making progress in addressing and mitigating the barriers to meeting the targets and expects to reach targets identified for 2014 and 2015.

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	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	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.*

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.

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). 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.

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.

California has faced several challenges in recruiting and rating sites serving children with high needs into the TQRIS, as described in this report's Executive Summary and the High-Quality, Accountable Programs sections. California is making progress in addressing and mitigating the barriers to meeting the targets and expects to reach targets identified for 2014 and 2015.

The initial efforts of the Consortia were focused on enrolling California State Preschool and Early Head Start/Head Start sites. It is expected that Consortia will outreach to programs receiving CCDF funds in the coming years, and will therefore serve more children in those program types.

In the beginning, California's school districts focused Title I funds only in the K-12 system as a remedial approach for upper elementary grades. With brain research indicating the importance of early education, school administrators are beginning to use Title I funds for preschools as a preventative measure in helping children with high-need acquire skills for school readiness. For this reason, California's Title I funded participating site counts are a low percentage of the total. California is in transition to a local control funding formula for school districts which will provide an opportunity to engage school administrators on the importance of using Title I funding for preschool. The California Implementation Team will explore with Consortia leadership how to further engage school administrators on participating in RTT-ELC and serve more preschool age children with these funds.

Regarding sites serving children with high need funded with IDEA Part B and Part C, those numbers are expected to remain low as more of the Consortia's efforts are focused on inclusive early learning settings.

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.

In December 2013, the CDE entered into a contract with the American Institutes for Research to evaluate the implementation, effectiveness and impact of California's TQRIS. For the validation study, California will pursue a rigorous study design and work plan to address the following:

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. Quality improvement --how quality improvement supports and incentives embedded in the QRIS affect the quality of early learning programs or child outcomes.
6. Child outcomes --the association of quality rating levels with children's early learning and development outcomes.
7. QRIS implementation --documentation of how QRISs function and issues that arise during implementation or expansion.

The evaluation will also include a child outcomes and effectiveness study, which includes the quality improvement, child outcomes, and system implementation.

Initial validation findings will be reported in December 2014.

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.

- ☑ (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 its 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.

In June 2013, the CDE released the Preschool Learning Foundations, volume 3, (http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/psfoundations.asp#psfoundvol3) and its companion document, the Preschool Curriculum Framework, volume 3 (http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/psframework.asp#psframevol3). 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 (http://www.caearlychildhoodonline.org/). 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. 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.

The Consortia developed the Pathways document to support program improvement using the various tools and resources identified in California's application with additional resources as Strengthening Families Five Protective Factors. The California Foundations and Frameworks are key resources that will be used by coaches to inform site plans and professional development plans.

The Consortia also utilizes two of California's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Quality Improvement professional development providers, the Program for Infant/Toddler Care (PITC) and the California Preschool Instructional Network (CPIN), to conduct training on the state's Foundations. Both of these elements of the Pathways are supported by CDE's AB 212 and F5CA's CARES Plus staff education, professional development, and retention activities.

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.

At the center of California's Early Learning and Development Standards are the Infant/Toddler Learning and Development Foundations and the Preschool Learning Foundations. Physical Development is covered in the Preschool Foundations and has three strands: (1) Fundamental Movement Skills (balance, loco motor skills, and manipulation skills), (2) Perceptual-Motor Skills and Movement Skills (body awareness, spatial awareness, and directional awareness), and (3) Active Physical Play (active participation, cardiovascular endurance and muscular strength, endurance, and flexibility). Health has three strands covered in the Preschool Foundations: (1) Health Habits (basic hygiene, oral health, knowledge of wellness, and sun safety), (2) Safety (injury prevention), and (3) Nutrition (nutrition knowledge, nutrition choices, and self-regulation of eating). Both the Infant/Toddler and Preschool Foundations also address social-emotional development.

Professional development on health standards is accessible in a variety of ways. The Pathways created by the Consortia to accompany the Matrix are a starting point for creating Quality Improvement plans for participating sites. The finalized Pathways incorporate online training modules which are part of the newly launched CECO Web site. The modules provide an overview and understanding of each of the Foundations' domains, including health and physical development. The CDE's Nutrition Services Division offers online modules on health and nutrition entitled Healthy and Active Preschoolers. These four modules cover nutritional fundamentals, mealtime environment, preschool nutrition and active physical play, and food safety.

Health, including screening, continues to be incorporated into the TQRIS through both rated Matrix and the Pathways elements in the following ways:

- Hybrid Rating Matrix
    - Community Care Licensing as Tier 1 (health, safety, and nutrition)
    - ERS (health and safety)
    - CLASS (social-emotional)
    - Screening, both developmental (social-emotional) and health

    - Child Observation (CDE's Desired Results Developmental Profile includes social-emotional and physical development and health)
- Pathways
    - Social-Emotional Development (including California Collaborative on the Social & Emotional Foundations for Early Learning)
    - Health, Nutrition, and Physical Activity (including USDA Child and Adult Care Food Program Guidelines)
    - Early Learning Foundations and Frameworks (health-related areas are listed above)
    - ERS (health and safety)
    - CLASS (social-emotional)
    - Early Childhood Educator Competencies (health, safety, and nutrition)

California's RTT-ELC also continued to leverage various screening efforts across the state in order to increase the number of children receiving screening and follow-up. Implementation Team members represented RTT-ELC at regular work group meetings of the State Interagency Team (SIT). The SIT work group is sponsored by the California Department of Public Health and focuses on the California Home Visiting Program (CHVP), which incorporates developmental screening into its program design.

California RTT-ELC funds provided training 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. This training assisted in increasing access to screening, and also included a component on providing follow-up and appropriate referrals.

New work in 2013 also included the execution of a contract with the California Department of Developmental Services (CDDS). As part of that contract CDDS, a participating state agency, committed to identifying and supporting best practices in developmental and health screening at the local level in collaboration with Consortia and other state-level and local partners. The CDDS is supporting the facilitation of the Statewide Screening Collaborative, which met once in 2013. The group includes members from state and local government, county First 5 Commissions, and community partners. Priorities set in 2013 were: 1) work with CDPH to further advance developmental screening measures and protocols; 2) work with Medi-Cal and health plans to advance reporting on Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (CHIPRA) core quality measures and explore the addition of a **Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set** performance measure on developmental screening, and 3) work with Early Care and Education workforce to promote developmental screening best practices and protocols. Quarterly meetings will continue in 2014.

California also successfully applied for an Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (ECCS) grant in 2013. The ECCS grant focuses on strengthening partnerships between California Home Visiting Program (CHVP), RTT-ELC, First 5 California, the First 5 Association, and the Office for Child Abuse and Prevention. Building on existing cross-agency system-change efforts lead by CHVP, the First 5 Association, California Project LAUNCH, Help Me Grow, and Strengthening Families, California will: 1) develop a mutually designed cross-agency agenda for change; 2) strengthen critical screening and referral mechanisms to ensure families are connected to services quickly; 3) promote development, implementation and reimbursement of innovative, practical, preventative and treatment interventions that mitigate adverse effects of toxic stress; and 4) provide mechanisms for California's early childhood workforce to better understand the importance of early brain development, reduction of toxic stress, and critical support of child and family resiliency. The ECCS Implementation Team will work in partnership with the RTT-ELC IAT to achieve grant outcomes.

The CDE also continued to participation in of the following health-related efforts aimed at increasing the knowledge base of ECE providers:

- Collaborating with Emergency Medical Service Authority in an effort to increase the amount of Health and Safety hours that are required for licensed child care providers.
- Supporting efforts to encourage local child care resource and referral agencies to participate in the federal Let's Move campaign.
- Developing age-appropriate messages for early childhood for the Superintendent of Public Instruction's Team California Healthy Kids campaign.
- Incorporating Health and Safety Best Practices into written training modules for child care providers and center staff in every county across the state.
- Participating in the Department of Defense-funded Health and Safety Regulatory Group that has led to the CDSS, Community Care Licensing Division proposing regulation changes for safe sleep and other topics.

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				Actuals	
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2
Number of Children with High Needs screened	126,184	128,707	230,000	234,600	239,292	157,008	186,429
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	43,433	44,201	48,621	49,593	50,584	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	1,157,902	1,175,270	1,187,022	1,198,892	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%	93.5%	94.0%	94.5%	95.0%	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.

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 2013, Head Start/Early Head Start for FY 2012/13, First 5 California Child Signature Program for July 2013, and the Department of Developmental Services Early Start Program for 2013.

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 survey. Updates will be provided in 2014 if this question is included in the 2013 statewide 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 California Health Interview 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.

Data included for "Number of Children with High Needs screened" is significantly under-reported due to California's varied screening delivery systems and lack of a centralized data system. For these reasons, California is unable to report a true count of screenings that accurately reflects the wide array of delivery methods. The Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems grant is focusing on creating a system for consistent collection of common screening data indicators across various provider types and should provide California with a more accurate picture of screening efforts.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

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.

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 2013, 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 2013 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.

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) informs 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 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. In 2013, the California Competencies Mapping Tool became operational. Forty two community colleges, 11 California State Universities and 19 professional development organizations have utilized the tool. To date, 103 courses and 19 trainings have been mapped with the Competencies via the web-based Mapping Tool. Information can be found at: http://www.childdevelopment.org/cs/cip/print/htdocs/cip/home.htm.

Another SAC project, E*arly Childhood Educator Competencies Self-Assessment Toolkit (ECE CompSAT)*, was developed to be a professional development self-reflection resource for the early childhood education workforce. The *ECE CompSAT* came online in February 2014 and will assist 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.

Through the *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. In October 2013, 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. Alignment will continue through 2015. Information can be found at: http://www.childdevelopment.org/cs/cdtc/print/htdocs/services_cap.htm.

Early Learning and Development System

The second essential element in California's Framework is the Early Learning and Development System, which includes the *California Preschool Learning Foundations, California Preschool Curriculum Framework, the Infant Toddler Learning and Development Foundations,* and the *California Infant Toddler Curriculum Framework*. Together with the Competencies, this structure meets the needs of California's diverse workforce. California's RTT-ELC grant implements a locally driven approach that is built upon existing quality improvement efforts and investments. California's Quality Continuum Framework, made up of the Matrix and the Pathways, is being used throughout the state to provide continuous quality improvement.

In 2013, the Pathways work group, comprised of representatives from each of the 17 consortia, gathered bi-monthly to construct the Pathways. The Pathways document was presented and approved by the Consortia in

October 2013. The work of establishing a Pathway coaching tool and an implementation guide will continue through 2014.

The Pathways include continuous quality elements to be used in the development of a participating early learning program's quality improvement plan. For a list of the professional development tools and resources included in the Pathways, *please refer to Appendix-C of California's 2013 APR attachment*.

These workforce opportunities provide a cohesive approach to quality improvement and were accessed by individuals in concert with local early childhood workforce efforts. The programs are integrated into every level of participation, from individual educator to workforce groups at their sites, to build a strong and competent workforce.

In 2013, in addition to the Pathways document, resources, T&TA supports listed above, the Pathway members compiled an extensive list of existing programs that the Consortia may access. This list will continue to be refined and will be available next year.

The following is a short list of additional statewide training opportunities available to the Consortia. In 2013, the Consortia were introduced and encouraged to connect their sites to these resources through their local T&TA systems.

Local Workforce Activities

The Consortia's RTT-ELC workforce support efforts are built upon their existing state structures (e.g., AB 212, CARES, CSP) seeking integration and sustainability. In addition, all are using existing local funding for workforce support of the TQRIS through locally funded programs and initiatives for their TQRIS. Emerging in this year's review of consortia reports is an increased “integration” of coaching strategies to enhance site-based Quality Improvement Plans.

In addition to statewide resources, the Consortia implemented TA activities (as defined by National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies and the National Association for the Education of Young Children). All 17 consortia reported using coaching and site-level continuous improvement plans. Most consortia combine coaching with advising (88%), mentoring (71%), and consultation strategies (82%). Over half of the Consortia reported using individual teacher professional growth plans (65%).

The following is an example of three counties that report making strides in coaching capacity during 2013:

- Alameda: Developed a cadre of local coach /consultants who are participating in CSEFEL, mapped CLASS coaching with training resources, and trained coaches in the content and the tools associated with QRIS.
- Merced: Established a coaching team trained and reliable in CLASS, ERS, ASQ/ASQ-SE, DRDP and MyTeachingPartner™. The coaching team adopted a strength-based coaching model and received training in The Art of Coaching: Effective Strategies for School Transformation from Elena Aguilar, which established trusting relationships between coaches and early educators receiving improvement support services. The county-wide approach to coaching was created to provide continuity, enhanced quality, and less duplication.
- San Francisco: Implemented a community of practice for TA providers to increase their skills and knowledge to ensure cultural and linguistic competency.

In addition to coaching and communities of practice strategies, the following workforce supports were launched to support the implementation of QRIS elements:

- Increased ERS training for potential assessors was reported by 12 of the 17 counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, El Dorado, LA Step, LAUP, Merced, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Yolo).
- Deepened efforts to operationalize support to their workforce by developing "forms and systems" for accessing support (Merced).
- Supported BA attainment through math cohorts (Sacramento).
- Maintained a Bachelor's Degree Cohort through a partnership with San Jose State University (First 5 Santa Clara).
- Developed a data base to capture professional development hours in anticipation of the statewide workforce registry (Santa Barbara).

A review of the reports showed an increased integration of the CSEFEL program into consortia workforce supports. An online overview was created of the CSEFEL teaching pyramid. Three of the consortia were engaged in implementation to fidelity of the Teaching Pyramid approach at several sites in 2013, seven more counties will be engaged in adopting this model in 2014, and the remaining are scheduled for 2015. A network of CSEFEL trainers and coaches is being formed.

The following three counties made significant progress in increased CSEFEL opportunities in their counties.

- Santa Cruz: All sites participated in the Teaching Pyramid workshops and 20 (50%) of their sites received Teaching Pyramid coaching.
- Santa Barbara: CSEFEL Teaching Pyramid training series continued for the second year, reaching an additional 78 teachers.
- Ventura: Provided CSEFEL Teaching Pyramid capacity building through train-the-trainer and coach training series. Fourteen (14) ECE professionals representing Head Start, the local R & R, First 5 Ventura County funded programs, State Preschool, private faith-based center and Ventura County Office of Education were trained to be Teaching Pyramid trainers and/or coaches to institutionalize and sustain CSEFEL practices beyond RTT-ELC.

All consortia report the use of site level Quality Improvement Plans, however, they also identified barriers in their efforts to full implementation. Including:

> *"Programs could potentially thrive with more coaching and TA, especially those with fewer resources. However there are not enough resources in our RTT-ELC project to provide coaching to all sites."*
>
> *- First 5 Santa Cruz*
>
> *"Teaming combined with TA helps program and teaching teams embed new strategies into practice and thus increases quality. However few teachers have paid release time in our county and many programs are challenged by union rules that make getting together during non-teaching hours difficult."*
>
> *- First 5 Santa Cruz*

The Consortia reported leveraging F5CA, county First 5, and Head Start funding sources to support their workforce development efforts.

A robust approach toward workforce development is braided through the integration of resources from multiple state agencies. Thirteen (13) counties within the Consortia participated in the CSP funded by F5CA. Starting in July 2013, CSP participants began receiving professional development support through a new T&TA resource,

the Early Education Effectiveness Exchange Learning Academy (E4). As CSP requirements are closely aligned with those of RTT-ELC, the majority of the consortia benefited from this professional development resource. The E4 provides T&TA to CSP classrooms using several modalities (regional meetings, a train-the-trainer approach, annual meetings, and a website). The Training and Technical Assistance Coordinators (TTACs) in each region are working with local CSP staff to obtain needed professional development and provide ongoing support for the implementation of their classroom, site and county level Improvement Plans which include their RTT-ELC goals.

All consortia leveraged the existing CDE AB 212: Child Care Salary and Retention Incentive Program. Most are leveraging F5CA's CARES Plus to provide financial incentives for professional development and academic advancement, and the CDE Stipends for California Child Development Permits and Career Incentive Grants. In addition, all consortia have engaged local community colleges and universities as part of their stakeholder groups to gather input from higher education and create stronger linkages. Ten consortia have established or are developing local cohort models for Associate and Bachelor degree attainment in general education or ECE content areas. Degree attainment is also promoted in two consortia through locally funded stipends, academic counseling, and increased course offerings in English, as well as Spanish.

The following describes workforce supports:

- *AB 212: Child Care Salary and Retention Incentive Program Funds* are provided to LPCs for child care staff retention activities. The LPCs develop countywide plans in accordance with approved guidelines and submit these plans to the EESD for review and approval. The funds are intended to supplement existing efforts and investments to retain qualified child care staff at the local level and to promote best practices that foster quality early childhood education. For more information, please visitko
- *First 5 California's Comprehensive Approaches to Raising Educational Standards (CARES) Plus Program* funds county-level partnerships that focus on providing research-based professional development opportunities designed to meet the needs of the local early learning workforce. The ultimate purpose of CARES Plus is to provide a stable and well qualified early educator workforce, to promote caring interactive relationships between children and teachers, and to improve child outcomes. In order to support improved teacher effectiveness, CARES Plus requires training on the CLASS and provides access for up to 500 participants annually to evidence-based, web based intensive coaching via MyTeaching Partner. CARES Plus continues to provide stipends, training, and higher education access that collectively serve to support and retain qualified early childhood educators.
- *California's Early Care and Education Workforce Registry*: The California ECE Workforce Registry is a state, regional and local collaboration designed to track and promote the education, training and experience of the early care and education workforce for the purpose of improving professionalism and workforce quality to positively impact children. Two of the RTT-ELC consortia, San Francisco and Los Angeles, are funded with county First 5 funds to implement the Workforce Registry. These consortia are encouraging RTT-ELC counties to use this Registry to capture workforce data.
- *California Early Childhood Mentor Program*: The CDE funds mentors through 100 community college campuses. Experienced teachers and directors were recruited as mentors to encourage other educators to remain in the field of early childhood education. There are 640 child care and development teachers and 145 director mentors who are available state-wide for mentoring. The mentor-directors and large family child care home provider mentors completed training on PAS and BAS, respectively, to assist local consortia with administrative support to participating programs.
- *Child Development Teacher/Supervisor Grant Program*: The CDE funds the California Student Aid Commission to provide assistance through these grants for college course work leading to the attainment of a California Child Development Permit at the teacher, master teacher, supervisor, or program director levels. Participants in this program are selected on the basis of their demonstrated

financial need and academic achievement. They must commit to working one full year in a licensed child care center for every year they receive a grant.

- *Child Development Training Consortium*: The CDE funds the CDTC to provide financial and TA is provided to students to access college-level child development coursework to raise the quality of care in early care and education settings throughout California. This training creates a pool of qualified staff for child care and development programs and addresses issues of access related to training, career ladder access for providers, staff retention, content flexibility, and cost effectiveness, while reaching out at the local level to assist in the recruitment and preparation of underrepresented groups. Participants, currently employed in a child care and development program, earn college units in child development and general education as required to attain the Child Development Permit. Students may attend regularly scheduled core curriculum classes. Classes may be offered at off-campus locations so that working students may have greater access.

On a related note, the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment (CSCCE) at UC Berkeley began to conduct the California Early Childhood Higher Education Inventory (Inventory). The Inventory assesses the capacity of the state's two- and four-year public and private institutions of higher education to address the professional preparation needs of our early childhood educators. The Inventory includes a particular emphasis on learning about the preparedness of faculty to teach content related to the mathematical development of young children, identifying the professional development needs of early childhood teacher educators, and learning about the type of content offered in degree programs related to family engagement. It allows policy makers and the higher education community to: establish a baseline description of higher education offerings for early childhood educators; establish baseline descriptions of early childhood education content and experiences offered within multiple subject credential programs; identify gaps and opportunities in the available offerings; assess variation in early childhood higher education programs; and assess changes in the capacity of the higher education system over time.

During 2013, the CSCCE implemented the community college portion of the Inventory, surveying the majority of the state's community colleges, and more than two-thirds of the faculty teaching in early childhood education and child development degree programs at the participating colleges. The results of the community college program and faculty surveys are in the process of being analyzed. The surveys for the bachelor's and graduate degree and multiple subject credential programs were launched in January 2014.The California Early Childhood Higher Education Inventory report (anticipated publication date, Fall 2014) will serve to inform policy and planning efforts in California related to early childhood education workforce development and professional preparation, including state-level discussions taking place regarding the potential establishment of an early education credential.

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
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	31	51	102	102	102	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	20,943	22,501

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

Please note that Year Two's target for "Total Number of Aligned Institutions and Providers" has been updated. Last year's target was incorrectly identified as 104, and should be been identified as 102.

The number of aligned institutions and providers includes all California Community Colleges that offer Early Childhood Education/Child Development coursework. At present, all of these institutions have agreed to provide coursework from a coordinated "Curriculum Alignment Project" course of study. As such, no additional community colleges will be added to years three and four.

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.

None.

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**	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	4,372	2.00%	4,459	3.00%	4,549	3.00%	4,640	3.00%	4,732	3.00%
Specify:	Child Development Assistant (Lowest)									
Credential Type 2	6,237	4.00%	6,362	4.00%	6,489	4.00%	6,619	4.00%	6,751	4.00%
Specify:	Child Development Associate Teacher									
Credential Type 3	3,782	2.00%	3,858	2.00%	3,935	2.00%	4,013	2.00%	4,094	2.00%
Specify:	Child Development Teacher									
Credential Type 4	999	1.00%	1,019	1.00%	1,039	1.00%	1,060	1.00%	1,081	1.00%
Specify:	Child Development Master Teacher									
Credential Type 5	3,501	2.00%	3,571	2.00%	3,642	2.00%	3,715	2.00%	3,790	2.00%
Specify:	Child Development Site Supervisor									
Credential Type 6	1,025	1.00%	1,046	1.00%	1,066	1.00%	1,088	1.00%	1,109	1.00%
Specify:	Child Development Program Director (Highest)									

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**	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	4,372	2.00%	4,732	3.00%	4,938	11.00%
Specify:	Child Development Assistant (Lowest)					
Credential Type 2	6,237	4.00%	7,340	4.00%	7,490	18.00%
Specify:	Child Development Associate Teacher					
Credential Type 3	3,782	2.00%	4,442	2.00%	5,117	33.00%
Specify:	Child Development Teacher					
Credential Type 4	999	1.00%	978	1.00%	1,098	8.00%
Specify:	Child Development Master Teacher					
Credential Type 5	3,501	2.00%	2,916	2.00%	3,261	-9.00%
Specify:	Child Development Site Supervisor					
Credential Type 6	1,025	1.00%	535	1.00%	597	-43.00%
Specify:	Child Development Program Director (Highest)					

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

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

Please note that a correction was made to Year 1 Credential Type 3 and Credential Type 6.

Data Sources: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Child Development Permits Issued: July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013) and Child Development Training Consortium.

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.

Regarding Targets 5 and 6, it is difficult to ascertain why there has been a drop in the number Child Development Site Supervisor Permits and Child Development Program Director Permits. This could be a reflection of some of these staff have chosen an alternate route, namely an Associate of Arts (AA) degree or Bachelor of Arts (BA). Four points are awarded if the lead teacher or family child care home (FCCH) provider/owner has a Child Development Site Supervisor Permit or an AA in Child Development (CD) or Early Childhood Education (ECE) and three points are awarded for for the Program Director who meets either of these options. The same situation is the case for five points if the lead teacher or FFCH provider has a Child Development Program Director Permit or a BA degree in CD or ECE and four points for the Program Director with either of these qualifications.

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. The CDE's assessment partners, WestEd and UC Berkeley Evaluation, Assessment, and Research (BEAR) Center, have developed the measures for physical well-being and motor development (including adaptive skills) under an agreement with the State of Illinois, which will be field tested and calibrated in 2014. The DRDP-SR (2015) with all domains will go into use in Fall 2015.

Validity and reliability testing has been completed and a calibration study of the DRDP-SR was completed in 2013.

Each of the Consortia is working with districts in their counties to support training and utilization of the DRDP-SR 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.

In 2013, 81 teachers in 16 districts were using DRDP-SR, with assessments for 1,280 TK and K students.

The Silicon Valley Foundation sponsored a Silicon Valley Regional Learning Forum on Kindergarten Readiness Assessment - Desired Results Developmental Profile School Readiness (DRDP-SR) in November 2013, to promote understanding and utilization of the instrument in the San Francisco Bay Area. The event featured two Oakland Unified School Districts K and TK teachers who described their use of the DRDP-SR. May districts are finding the results useful and plan to use it in the spring to measure progress.

The CDE has an RTT-ELC contract with UC BEAR Center to do web hosting of DRDPtech, which allows districts to upload their kindergarten entry assessment results. CLOUD technology allows this data to be linked to the state's child longitudinal data system (CalPADS).

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	285,529	54.50%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	555,897	54.50%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	811,984	54.50%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	1,653,410	54.50%
[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 2014.

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]	51,009	2.00%
Are English learners[2]	965,769	38.00%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	4,273	0.15%
Are migrant[3]	14,678	0.58%
Are homeless[4]	125,757	4.00%
Are in foster care	17,729	0.70%
Other as identified by the State	991,184	39.00%
Describe:		

[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 Reporting System on 1/13/14. "Special education enrollment by age and disability" data obtained for December 2012. 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 of 2,541,497 pulled from American FactFinder, Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Single Year of Age and Sex for the United States, States, and Puerto Rico Commonwealth: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2012, U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, Release Date: June 2013

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 (38%). This percentage was obtained from DataQuest, the California Department of Education Reporting System on 1/13/14. Data for "Statewide English Learners by language by grade" and "Statewide enrollment by grade" for 2012-13 was used to calculate the percentage of kindergartners that were designated English Language Learners. The total number of 0-4 year old California children (2,541,497) was multiplied by .38 to obtain the estimated number of English learners. California 0-4 year old population estimate was pulled from American FactFinder, Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Single Year of Age and Sex for the United States, States, and Puerto Rico Commonwealth: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2012, U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, Release Date: June 2013

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 2011-12 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 2011-12 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 www. urbaninstitute.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 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 1/13/14

At Risk of Development Delay: Data obtained by analyzing data from UCLA Health Policy Research Center's 2009 California Health Interview Survey on October 4, 2011. 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 mutlipled by the estimated percentage (.39). California 0-4 year old population est.

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	0	0	134,853	134,853
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:	CDE Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS) for April 2013			
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	5,292	17,398	111,028	133,718
Data Source and Year:	Head Start Program Information Report Enrollment Statistics Report for 2012-2013.			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	3,160	46,684	53,519	103,363
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	0	5532	13,642	19,174
Data Source and Year:	CDE Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for School Year 12-13.			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	5,464	29,187	64,255	98,906
Data Source and Year:	CDE Child Development Management Information System (CDMIS) for April 2013 *ted in the State.*			
[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.

None.

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	95,130	802	7,663	10,234	740	0	17,249
Specify:							
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	101,391						
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	98,204	645	7,513	30,857	901	0	29,769

[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.

Head Start Program Information Enrollment Statistics Report for 2012-2013 does not give Race categories as required by the column headings of this table. By ethnicity, there were 34,281 non-Hispanic/non-Latino children for a total of 135,672 children. These same children by race, but not "non-Hispanic" are: 7,089 American Indian/Alaska Native, 5,986 Asian, 12,330 Black/African American, 630 Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 63,412 White, 7,431 Biracial/Multi-racial, 29,776 other race, and 9,026 unspecified race.

IDEA Part B and Part C and Title 1 ESEA data sources don't have enrollment numbers by race or ethnicity.

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**
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	0	0	0
State-funded preschool	373,695,000	481,003,000	506,965,000
Specify:	State General Fund		
State contributions to IDEA, Part C	72,427,000	73,237,000	75,787,000
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	0	0	0
Total State contributions to CCDF[2]	1,428,156,000	1,231,606,000	1,249,409,000
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded
If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded	756,878,774	454,222,878	446,784,110
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs[3]	408,563,000	364,998,000	377,484,000
Other State contributions 1	17,259,034	17,716,003	21,587,546
Specify:	F5CA Power of Preschool Bridge Program		
Total State contributions:	1,926,405,034	1,687,557,003	1,724,267,546

[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.

Additional funds were identified which may be counted as State contributions to IDEA Part C.

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 Power of Preschool.

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**
State-funded preschool *(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)*	101,414	149,361	134,853
Specify:			
Early Head Start and Head Start[2] *(funded enrollment)*	121,506	122,558	133,718
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 *(annual December 1 count)*	80,226	80,428	103,636
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
Programs receiving CCDF funds *(average monthly served)*	125,899	102,610	98,906

[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.

None.

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.

The California Infant/Toddler Learning and Development Foundations describe developmental domains for social-emotional, language, cognitive and perceptual/motor development. The Preschool Learning Foundations (PLF) Volume 1 (V. 1) describes developmental domains for social-emotional, language and literacy, English-language development and mathematics and addresses approaches to learning in the introductory sections of the social-emotional domain. A Preschool Curriculum Framework aligned to PCF V. 1 provides comprehensive guidance on planning a developmentally appropriate learning plan. PLF V. 2 describes developmental domains for visual and performing arts, physical development and health. In 2013 a new PLF V.3 describing developmental domains in history, social science and science was released along with the corresponding aligned PCF V.3. The foundations and frameworks are part of California's Early Learning and Development System, which also includes the Desired Results Assessment System, infant/toddler and preschool program guidelines, and a comprehensive system of professional development activities.

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.

None.

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)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$35,070.51	$79,071.48	$114,141.99
2. Fringe Benefits	$508.49	$7,111.23	$7,619.72
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$2,378,346.00	$3,838,443.26	$6,216,789.26
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$295,571.17	$295,571.17
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$2,413,925.00	$4,220,197.14	$6,634,122.14
10. Indirect Costs	$126,711.10	$286,614.13	$413,325.23
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$9,850,000.00	$10,150,000.00	$20,000,000.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$12,062.77	$26,904.13	$38,966.90
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$12,402,698.87	$14,683,715.40	$27,086,414.27
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$12,402,698.87	$14,683,715.40	$27,086,414.27

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

In accordance with the guidance provided in the RTT-ELC APR Instructions received this year, the actual amount reported includes both expenditures and encumbrances in this year and all grant years with encumbrances. This provides a better display of the funding for each project. For those contracts subject to indirect costs, the encumbrance is displayed in the same grant year as the indirect cost expenditures. It should also reduce the number of amendments required, as encumbrances generally do not need to be moved to future years. The expenditures do not necessarily occur in the same grant year as the encumbrance, but the encumbrance does not need to be changed.

Most other issues are related to unanticipated delays in awarding contracts and delays in procurement resulting in encumbrances/expenditures occurring in future grant years. Also, the hiring process for the new positions has taken longer than expected. However, the positions should be filled in the next few months. Some of these issues also resulted in a corresponding change to other position related costs and indirect cost expenditures.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

There will be changes to all the project budgets to reflect the items noted above. This includes moving unexpended funds to future years and adjusting budgets to reflect encumbrances.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Grants Management

Budget Table: Project 1			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$35,070.51	$59,450.08	$94,520.59
2. Fringe Benefits	$508.49	$967.62	$1,476.11
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$3,934.85	$3,934.85
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$35,579.00	$64,352.55	$99,931.55
10. Indirect Costs	$7,310.39	$19,330.81	$26,641.20
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$12,062.77	$26,904.13	$38,966.90
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$54,952.16	$110,587.49	$165,539.65
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$54,952.16	$110,587.49	$165,539.65

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 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 was a delay in filling the 3.0 new positions. It is anticipated that there will be staff in place by March 1, 2014.This also impacts the "Fringe Benefits", and "Other" categories. The Technical Assistance funds are used mainly for out-of-state travel. There has been a limited amount of out-of-state travel this year and any unexpended funds will be moved to the subsequent grant years. While there has been some in-state travel, the documents have not been processed yet and therefore are not included on the CDE accounting reports. The CDE is in the process of obtaining estimates for the equipment purchases. It is expected that the equipment will be purchased in Grant Year 3. The indirect cost charges are based on actual expenditures so there is a corresponding decrease in those costs due to the items mentioned above.

Project 1 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The unspent balances will be moved to Grant Years 3 and 4.

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)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	$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	$20,000,000.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$9,850,000.00	$10,150,000.00	$20,000,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$9,850,000.00	$10,150,000.00	$20,000,000.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

In accordance with the guidance provided in the RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report (APR) Instructions received this year, the actual amounts reported include both the expenditures and encumbrances. This better reflects the allocation of funds as these funds are obligated specifically for grants to the Consortia and cannot be used for other activities without approval.

Project 2 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

While there is no change to the total amount allocated for the Consortia, the amount for each grant year will change to reflect when the funds are encumbered (obligated).

Budget Table: Project 3 – Home Visiting

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

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

In accordance with the guidance provided in the RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report (APR) Instructions received this year, the actual amounts reported include both the expenditures and encumbrances. This better reflects the allocation of funds as these funds are encumbered in a contract specifically for Home Visiting activities and cannot be used for other activities without amending the contract.

Project 3 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

While there is no change to the total amount allocated for the Home Visiting project, the amount for the grant years will change.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Screening Tool Distribution

Budget Table: Project 4			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$28,358.00	$0.00	$28,358.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$291,636.32	$291,636.32
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$28,358.00	$291,636.32	$319,994.32
10. Indirect Costs	$5,955.35	$61,243.63	$67,198.98
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$34,313.35	$352,879.95	$387,193.30
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$34,313.35	$352,879.95	$387,193.30

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

In accordance with the guidance provided in the RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report (APR) Instructions received this year, the actual amounts reported include both the expenditures and encumbrances. This better reflects the allocation of funds for the portion of these funds encumbered in a contract for Screening Tool Distribution activities. These funds cannot be used for any other purpose without amending the contract. This contract is subject to indirect costs which are charged at the time the contract is encumbered. It is more appropriate that the encumbrance is displayed in the same time period as the indirect cost charges. The balance in the "Other" category is to purchase Ages and Stages Questionnaire kits and packets. The purchase order is in process and the funds will be expended in Grant Year 3.

Project 4 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The balance in the "Other" category will be moved to Grant Year 3 to correspond to when the expenditure will occur. The budget for the contract will be moved to Grant Year 1 to reflect when the encumbrance occurred.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Curricula Development for Higher Education

Budget Table: Project 5			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$170,000.00	$224,542.00	$394,542.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$170,000.00	$224,542.00	$394,542.00
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$170,000.00	$224,542.00	$394,542.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$170,000.00	$224,542.00	$394,542.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

In accordance with the guidance provided in the RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report (APR) Instructions received this year, the actual amounts reported include both the expenditures and encumbrances. This better reflects the allocation of funds as these funds are encumbered in a contract specifically for the Curricula Development for Higher Education project and cannot be used for other activities without amending the contract.

Project 5 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

While there is no change to the total amount allocated for this project, the amount for the grant years will change.

Budget Table: Project 6 – CSEFEL

Budget Table: Project 6			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$890,056.00	$939,504.00	$1,829,560.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$890,056.00	$939,504.00	$1,829,560.00
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$890,056.00	$939,504.00	$1,829,560.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$890,056.00	$939,504.00	$1,829,560.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

In accordance with the guidance provided in the RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report (APR) Instructions received this year, the actual amounts reported include both the expenditures and encumbrances for this year and all grant years with encumbrances. This better reflects the allocation of funds as these funds are encumbered in a contract specifically for CSEFEL and cannot be used for other activities without amending the contract.

Project 6 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

While there is no change to the total amount allocated for CSEFEL, the amount for the grant years will be changed to reflect encumbered amounts.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Licensing Website

Budget Table: Project 7			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

Due to the delay in an executed contract with the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), there were no expenditures to report for this project in 2013.

Project 7 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

We expect to execute a contract with CDSS in early 2014 which will affect the budget and expenditures for 2013. Because no expenditures were made during 2013, we have revised the budget for 2014 and 2015 to reflect new budget estimates for this project.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Linking KEA Data To CALPADS

Budget Table: Project 8			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$19,621.40	$19,621.40
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$6,143.61	$6,143.61
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$387,296.00	$387,296.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$413,061.01	$413,061.01
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$93,039.69	$93,039.69
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$0.00	$506,100.70	$506,100.70
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$0.00	$506,100.70	$506,100.70

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table 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 2. A portion of the savings was redirected to provide additional funding for the contract. The remainder was moved to future grant years. The Contract process took longer than expected and the contract was not executed until September 2013. As a result the encumbrance amounts were revised. The budget has been changed to reflect the new amounts.

Project 8 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The unexpended amount for personnel will be allocated to Grant Years 3 and 4. The budgeted amount for the contract line item was increased slightly and has been revised to reflect the actual encumbrance amounts for each year of the contract.

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

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

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

In accordance with the guidance provided in the RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report (APR) Instructions received this year, the actual amounts reported include both the expenditures and encumbrances. This better reflects the allocation of funds as these funds are encumbered in a contract specifically for this project and cannot be used for other activities without amending the contract. The funds for the project were encumbered in Grant Year 1.

Project 9 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The change for this project will be to display and budget and expenditures in Grant Year 1.

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

Budget Table: Project 10			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$540,216.00	$50,000.00	$590,216.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$540,216.00	$50,000.00	$590,216.00
10. Indirect Costs	$113,445.36	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$653,661.36	$50,000.00	$703,661.36
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$653,661.36	$50,000.00	$703,661.36

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

In accordance with the guidance provided in the RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report (APR) Instructions received this year, the actual amounts reported include both the expenditures and encumbrances for this year and all grant years with encumbrances. This better reflects the allocation of funds as these funds are encumbered in a contract specifically for Screening Tool Distribution and cannot be used for other activities without amending the contract. These contracts are subject to indirect costs which are charged at the time the contract is encumbered. It is more appropriate that the encumbrance is displayed along with the indirect cost charges.

Project 10 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

While there is no change to the amount allocated for the Screening Tool Distribution contracts, the amounts for the grant years will change.

Budget Table: Project 11 – Professional Development For Early Start

Budget Table: Project 11			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$285,716.00	$285,714.00	$571,430.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$285,716.00	$285,714.00	$571,430.00
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$285,716.00	$285,714.00	$571,430.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$285,716.00	$285,714.00	$571,430.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

In accordance with the guidance provided in the RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report (APR) Instructions received this year, the actual amounts reported include both the expenditures and encumbrances. This better reflects the allocation of funds as these funds are encumbered in a contract specifically for this project and cannot be used for other activities without amending the contract.

Project 11 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The change for this project is to revise the budget and expenditures for Grant Years 1 and 2.

Budget Table: Project 12 – Evaluation

Budget Table: Project 12			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$1,701,387.26	$1,701,387.26
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$1,701,387.26	$1,701,387.26
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$113,000.00	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$0.00	$1,814,387.26	$1,814,387.26
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$0.00	$1,814,387.26	$1,814,387.26

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

The initial budgeted amounts for the Evaluation reflect estimates of the amounts needed for each year. The contract is now in place and the budget needs to be revised to display the actual encumbered amounts.

Project 12 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The budgeted amounts in Grant Years 1, 2 and 3 will need to be changed.

Budget Table: Project 13 – Inter-Rater Reilability

Budget Table: Project 13			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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 Table Narrative

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

Due to the delay in an executed contract with First 5 California, there were no expenditures to report for this project in 2013.

Project 13 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

We expect to execute a contract with First 5 California in early 2014 which will affect the budget and expenditures for 2013. Because no expenditures were made during 2013, we have revised the budget for 2014 and 2015 to reflect new budget estimates for this project.