

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

## Georgia



JUNE 2015



Race to the Top  
Early Learning Challenge

## Table of Contents

<b>APR Cover Sheet</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Certification</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Successful State Systems</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Governance Structure .....	6
Stakeholder Involvement .....	7
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	9
Participating State Agencies.....	11
<b>High-Quality, Accountable Programs</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	12
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application) .....	16
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	20
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	23
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	26
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) .....	30
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) .....	31
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	35
<b>Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Promoting Early Learning Outcomes</b> .....	<b>39</b>
Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application) .....	39
Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application) .....	41
Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application) .....	43
<b>Early Childhood Education Workforce</b> .....	<b>45</b>
Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application) .....	45
Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Section D(2) of Application) .....	47
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1).....	49
Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2).....	50
<b>Measuring Outcomes and Progress</b> .....	<b>53</b>
Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application) .....	53
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application) .....	55
<b>Data Tables</b> .....	<b>57</b>
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	57
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs .....	58
Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age .....	60

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	62
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.....	68
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State.....	69
<b>Budget and Expenditure Tables .....</b>	<b>71</b>
Budget Summary Table .....	71
Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Management.....	73
Budget Table: Project 2 - Early Education Empowerment Zones.....	75
Budget Table: Project 3 – Quality Rated Access and Availability .....	77
Budget Table: Project 4 – Quality Rated Validation .....	79
Budget Table: Project 5 - Promoting Early Learning Outcomes .....	81
Budget Table: Project 6 - Comprehensive Assessment System .....	83
Budget Table: Project 7 - Statewide Family Engagement and Community Grants.....	85
Budget Table: Project 8 – Center-based Home Visitation and FFN Care .....	87
Budget Table: Project 9 - Workforce Knowledge and Competencies .....	89
Budget Table: Project 10 - Supporting Early Educators.....	91
Budget Table: Project 11 – Kindergarten Entry Assessment.....	93
Budget Table: Project 12 – Unified Data System.....	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 cells in a table indicates that the Grantee did not provide data or did not select the option.*



## APR Cover Sheet

### General Information

1. **PR/Award #:** S412A130039
2. **Grantee Name:** Office of the Governor, State of Georgia
3. **Grantee Address:** 203 State Capitol, Atlanta, GA, 30334
4. **Project Director Name:** Kristin Bernhard  
**Title:** Deputy Commissioner for System Reform  
**Phone #:** (404) 463-6089      **Fax #:** (770) 357-4874  
**Email Address:** kristin.bernhard@dec.al.ga.gov

### Reporting Period Information

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

### Indirect Cost Information

#### 6. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?  Yes  No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government?  Yes  No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): 07/01/2012 to

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



## Certification

**The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:**

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

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

Yes  No

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

**Signed by Authorized Representative**

**Name:** Amy Jacobs

**Title:** Commissioner

## 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.*

In 2014, the first year of implementation, the state was able to use the Early Learning Challenge opportunity to strengthen and build on the already state's strong early education foundation. This is most evident in its successes, such as creating empowerment zones, increasing participation in the Georgia's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, and expanding opportunities for early education teachers to incorporate the use of Early Learning and Development standards. However, the successes are also evident in the way Georgia used the Early Learning Challenge opportunity to solidify the critical role of early learning in the state's educational pipeline.

The successes were created through purposeful stakeholder engagement, appropriate and meaningful use of data, and a realignment of many of Georgia's early education programs. Beginning with the Georgia's Pre-K program, the state has historically used a system building approach in developing and expanding early education opportunities for children and families. This includes the development of a distinct education department dedicated to early learning-Bright from the Start: Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL) and the alignment of key health and safety and family engagement programs in the state's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System-Quality Rated.

The Year One implementation of Georgia's Early Learning Challenge initiative demonstrates the long commitment the state has made to its youngest learners and its eventual success in meeting all Early Learning Challenge targets.

### **Year One Successes:**

Georgia's Early Learning Challenge grant is organized in the five themes outlined in the grant. The following details the state's progress in each of those key areas:

#### Building State Systems:

- *Creating a System Level Reform Division* - Georgia's Early Learning Challenge grant is administered by DECAL and the work is organized under a new division: System Reform. This division oversees the work of the grant and Georgia's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. By placing oversight under one division ensured that critical staffing and resource needs were met.
- *Establishing Four Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs)* - Utilizing both a quantitative data analysis and a qualitative "site-visit" process where communities demonstrated the "non-tangibles" that make or break implementation, the state identified four zones that would be targeted with additional resources and used to pilot many Early Learning Challenge initiatives. The four zones represent distinct geographic areas of the state. In each zone, a Birth to Eight team has been identified and is beginning the process of identifying community level strategies to improve early education outcomes in the areas.
- *Incorporating Research to Policy/Practice Feedback Loops in ELC Oversight* - By incorporating key research and evaluation staffing in the grant management structure, the state has established mechanisms for on-going research, evaluation, and data analysis. Most importantly, these mechanisms are incorporated in the day to day management of the projects ensuring that appropriate feedback loops are maintained.

### High-Quality Accountable Programs:

- *Increasing Participation in Quality Rated* - The increase in participation in Quality Rated, Georgia's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, is one of the state's Year One success stories. In 2014, approximately 617 of programs enrolled in Quality Rated and the state more than doubled the number of programs rated. Aggressive recruitment targets were met by incorporating an “all hands on deck” approach where child care licensing consultants and child care resource and referral agencies worked in tandem to identify, follow-up, and encourage child care programs to participate.
- *Revising Quality Rated to Increase Participation and Improve Quality* - The state utilized validation work to begin the revision process. Such revisions include streamlining the application process, expanding renewal options, and reducing the amount of paperwork required. Many of these revisions allowed programs and technical assistance providers to focus on the quality aspects that impact child outcomes.

### Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children:

- *Expanding the Use of the GELDS* - In Year One, Georgia greatly expanded the opportunities for early educators and families to use the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS) in their instruction and interactions. 13 “Play to Learn” spots, each covering a specific skill outlined in the GELDS, were created and are airing across the state on Georgia Public Broadcasting (GPB) network through June 2015. Encompassed in the GELDS work is a partnership with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) to use the GELDS to support dual language learners.
- *Establishing a Comprehensive Assessment Task Force* - This Task Force is charged with developing a summary document of best practices related to formative assessments. In 2014, Task Force members were identified and met once. At the first meeting, subcommittees were established and each subcommittee met twice. The recommendation document will be published in 2015.
- *Creating Additional Family Engagement Opportunities* - A Family Engagement Task Force was convened in the latter half of July 2014 with the purpose of defining family engagement in Georgia, creating Family Engagement Strategies and Practices, and providing recommendations for the revisions to the Family Engagement Standard in Quality Rated.
- *Supporting Family, Friend, and Neighbor Care* - Mini-grants were offered to Head Start providers to deliver training to family, friend, and neighbor caregivers

### Great Early Education Workforce

- *Supporting Early Educators* - The state made significant progress in supporting Early Educators by expanding the state's INCENTIVES and SCHOLARSHIPS programs and specifically targeting educators earning their FIRST and SECOND credentials. Over 500 additional educators were able to take advantage of the programs.
- *Revising the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework* - The state began the work of revising the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and drafting competencies for home visitors to be included in the framework.

### Measuring Outcomes and Progress:

- *Quality Rated Validation* - The state began the formal validation process. This encompassed creating an external validation advisory committee, conducting focus groups, and developing analysis strategies.
- *Developing the Kindergarten Entry Profile* - A contract was awarded to facilitate the development of the Kindergarten Entry Profile with committees beginning the work in 2015.
- *Creating the Cross-Agency Child Data System (CACDS)* - Data sharing elements for phase one and data sharing agreements across agencies were finalized. The group began the work of identifying research questions that will be addressed in CACDS.

### **Lessons Learned/Challenges:**

In the first year of implementation, three lessons learned and challenges emerged. First, it took the state longer than anticipated to fill key positions. However, by the end of 2014, most key positions had been filled with the remaining to be filled in the first quarter of 2015. Since many of these positions are specialized, it sometimes takes longer to find the right fit.

The second lesson learned did not ultimately become a challenge, but rather solidified the importance of taking a system level approach in the state's Early Learning Challenge work. At the beginning of the fourth quarter, it looked as if the state would not meet the Quality Rated recruitment targets. Knowing that a delay in recruiting would have a "ripple" effect in other projects and others aspects of Quality Rated, the state developed a multi-prong approach that included direct correspondence from DECAL's Commissioner, utilized health and safety consultants, and created performance measures for the state's child care resource and referral agencies. By taking this aligned approach, the state was not only able to meet the recruitment goals, but exceed them.

Finally, there has been a large amount of "buzz" around many of the Early Learning Projects. While this is a good thing, it became evident that misinformation was being communicated about some of the projects. Therefore the state adopted a new communication strategy around the Early Learning Challenge that will facilitate a shared understanding of the work and what it entails.

### **Strategies**

As detailed in the description of Successful State Systems, Georgia has adopted a management, "system-level" strategy that will enable the state to meet all the targets. It has been noted that Year One was truly just the beginning. It was a year for the state to strengthen its foundation and ensure that the resources were there to ramp up for Year Two. The structures put in place in Year One will ensure that Year Two will be as successful, if not more successful than Year One.



## 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).*

Governance and administrative and fiscal oversight of Georgia's Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant is grounded in Bright from the Start: Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL). In 2014, DECAL celebrated its tenth anniversary as a separate, legislatively created agency dedicated to coordinating and providing early care and education services for children from birth through age five. In addition to the RTT-ELC grant, DECAL administers major federal and state programs, including Georgia's Pre-K Program, the Head Start-State Collaboration Office, Quality Rated (Georgia's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System), child care licensing, the Child Care Development Fund child care subsidy program, the Child and Adult Care Food Program, and the Summer Food Service Program. The consolidation of these key programs in the lead agency for the RTT-ELC grant, combined with the agency's strong relationships with other child serving agencies, helped expedite the quick implementation of grant projects in Year One.

In January 2014, DECAL Commissioner Bobby Cagle hired Kristin Bernhard as Deputy Commissioner for System Reform to serve as grant manager for Georgia's RTT-ELC. Identifying a project director early in the lifetime of the grant ensured that the state had strong internal project management procedures from the beginning.

In June 2014, Governor Nathan Deal appointed then Commissioner Cagle to serve as interim director of the Division of Family and Children Services and named Amy M. Jacobs, formerly a senior policy adviser for the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, as the interim Commissioner of DECAL. In November 2014, her appointment as Commissioner was made permanent.

### Georgia's Key Governance Stakeholders

- **The Georgia Children's Cabinet**, chaired by Georgia's First Lady Sandra Deal, is composed of the heads of all state agencies that serve the needs of Georgia's children from birth to age 18 and of select community, philanthropic, education, and business stakeholders. The Cabinet also serves as Georgia's State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care. During Year One of the grant, the DECAL Commissioner provided the Cabinet with formal updates on the implementation of the grant's 12 projects every six months, providing input to and feedback on early learning activities in the state.
- The Commissioner of the DECAL sits on the **Alliance of Education Agency Heads (AEAH)**, composed of the heads of all education departments in the state. The other members of the Alliance include the Chancellor of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, State School Superintendent, President of the Georgia Student Finance Commission, Commissioner of the Technical College System of Georgia, Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Student Achievement, Executive Secretary of the Professional Standards Commission, and the Governor's Education Policy Advisor. The Alliance received formal updates on the implementation of the grant's 12 projects from the Deputy Commissioner for System Reform every six months.

- Part of Georgia's governance structure also included establishing an **Implementation Team**, composed of key staff members from Participating State Agencies ultimately responsible for successfully implementing one of the 12 projects in Georgia's RTT-ELC grant. The cross-agency implementation team meets monthly to review progress on the state's scope of work, troubleshoot any challenges, and ensure collaboration across grant projects.
- DECAL developed **RTT-ELC Advisory Committees** for each grant project. These advisory committees, composed of stakeholders such as ELD family and center providers, ELD teachers, technical assistance providers, community and business leaders, higher education faculty, staff from other state agencies, and philanthropic organizations met either monthly or quarterly to provide strategic guidance on their respective grant project.

Over the initial year of the RTT-ELC grant, DECAL has established a foundation for both leading and managing grant execution for Georgia. This foundation-building includes guiding and supporting grant execution and communicating with key stakeholders at all levels to ensure collaboration and accountability.

---

## 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 Georgia, numerous professional associations, foundations, state agencies, legislative groups, and general interested parties are involved in or concerned about supporting young children and their families. Keeping them all informed of and involved in the state's early learning system reform work is a focus of Georgia's RTT-ELC efforts. In addition to establishing diverse communication strategies to dispense information about RTT-ELC implementation, DECAL also established a variety of stakeholder groups to provide feedback and guidance on developing and implementing specific RTT-ELC projects. More than just opportunities for the state to share information to affected stakeholders, these groups provided a meaningful avenue for diverse stakeholders to actually shape the development of the state's RTT-ELC work. A particular strength in Georgia's stakeholder engagement efforts around RTT-ELC was the selection of the Early Education Empowerment Zones.

### **Stakeholder Involvement in the Early Education Empowerment Zones**

Stakeholder involvement has been the cornerstone of Georgia's Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs). As written into Georgia's Early Learning Challenge Grant, the E3Zs were designed to contain approximately 10,000 children living in conditions of high need, where the state would then utilize the RTT-ELC grant to layer in additional funding and supports. Georgia's RTT-ELC grant application did not specify where these zones would exist throughout the state, although Georgia did outline the parameters of having one large metropolitan county as a zone, one zone containing a mid-sized city, and two rural zones each composed of several counties each. The goals set forth by Georgia's leadership were to identify these zones and implement best practices and interventions within these zones in a concentrated and concerted way so that young children would be better prepared for Kindergarten and for a strong start in life. The broad vision for this work has been to learn about the levers that enable and barriers that prohibit success through Implementation Science so that our experiences can translate to scale at a time when funding is sufficient to provide similar opportunities throughout Georgia.

In 2014, Georgia carefully selected the E3Zs using a two-phase collaborative process with community partners. Our successes throughout the year included multiple steps related to this process:

- A quantitative selection methodology was designed by DECAL leadership. Factors considered in the quantitative selection process included variables related to: education, poverty, capacity, quality, and family characteristics. More specifically, primary data points included: percentages of students who did not meet the standard for the state's 3rd grade reading Criterion-Referenced Competency Test, percentages of licensed child care capacity filled by children receiving Childcare and Parent Services subsidy, overall poverty rates, percentages of births to mothers with less than a 12th grade education, and percentages of eligible sites in Quality Rated. Secondary indicators included: free and reduced meal eligibility rates, percentages of children with a home language other than English, premature birth rates, Pre-K saturation rates, and presence of 2- or 3-star Quality Rated programs. DECAL leadership reviewed these criteria with the input of state-level stakeholders and partners. This first stage of the selection process identified eleven potential E3Zs.
- DECAL leadership and community partners at varying levels participated in a qualitative selection process to more clearly match need with local capacity. Each of the eleven potential zones were invited to create community presentations to be heard and reviewed by state, non-profit, and foundation representatives. From June through August 2014, each potential zone, whether individual counties or conglomerations of several counties (as many as nine), prepared presentations based on community strengths and plans for implementation, given a successful application. In visiting each potential E3Z, reviewers assessed the presentations by examining connections between partnerships including: technical colleges or universities with ECE or Child and Family Development degree track and lab school; Head Start and/or Early Head Start providers; home visiting programs; and local foundation and business support. Communities were also assessed based on having at least 25 percent of child care programs participating in Quality Rated and a high percentage of mixed delivery within Georgia's Pre-K Program providers. Secondary indicators in this qualitative selection methodology included criteria such as: presence of a Georgia Family Connection Partnership Collaborative with Early Childhood Education as a selected goal; civic club commitment from Rotary, Kiwanis, etc.; Chamber of Commerce commitment; local capacity to support new business; participation of faith-based partners; and support from local public school superintendents. Reviewing these components enabled assessors to understand each area's ability to pilot, refine, and model early education initiatives and partnerships.

In September 2014, DECAL announced the selection of four zones: Clarke County, Bibb County, a North Georgia Zone consisting of Catoosa, Murray, Whitfield, Gilmer, and Gordon counties, and a South Georgia Zone consisting of Colquitt, Cook, Brooks, Lowndes, and Echols counties. In October 2014, E<sup>3</sup>Z Community Commitment celebrations were held in each of the selected zones, officially launching the work in each area. Many individuals who had contributed to the success of their community presentations earlier in the summer participated in these celebrations. These community leaders were present to express continued interest in developing the early childhood system within their area.

After the E<sup>3</sup>Zs were identified, DECAL posted position descriptions for four E<sup>3</sup>Z Community Coordinators and one E<sup>3</sup>Z Business Operations Specialist. By December 2014, two of four Coordinators and the E<sup>3</sup>Z Business Operations Specialist had been hired and had begun in their respective roles. The Community Coordinators in Clarke County and in North Georgia immediately began reaching out to community stakeholders to establish, or build upon, local Birth to Eight teams, and the Business Operations Specialist immediately began connecting

with fellow participating state agencies to identify important next steps in establishing local economic incentive packages to encourage high quality child care programs to either expand or open in the zones.

### **Stakeholder Involvement Across Other Grant Projects**

Stakeholder involvement has also been meaningfully incorporated across nearly all of Georgia's RTT-ELC projects. Detailed in the sections of this report that follow, Georgia regularly convened the following groups throughout Year One of the RTT-ELC grant to engage stakeholders in dialogue to improve implementation of the RTT-ELC projects:

- External Quality Rated Validation Team
- Quality Rated Focus Groups for Child Care and Technical Assistance Providers
- Child Care Resource and Referral Agency Focus Groups
- ECE Teacher Teams for GELDS Resource Development
- Family Engagement Task Force
- Comprehensive Assessment Task Force

### **Additional Stakeholder Involvement Opportunities**

In June 2014, the Governor and First Lady opened the Governor's Mansion to host a reception for all organizations that wrote letters of support for Georgia's RTT-ELC grant application. DECAL and the Georgia Early Education Alliance for Ready Students (GEEARS), a key advocacy partner, co-sponsored the event, attended by over 100 elected officials and leaders in the education, business, and philanthropic communities. The reception provided an opportunity to inform the early supporters of Georgia's RTT-ELC grant with information about key implementation milestones and to present them with targeted opportunities to remain engaged in the state's system building work.

In August 2014, DECAL also hosted an in-depth Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge stakeholder briefing that was open to the public. At this briefing, each member of the state's Implementation Team presented to approximately 60 individuals representing a broad cross-section of ELD stakeholders attended in person, with another 200 attending via live simulcast, which allowed for both those participating in person and online to ask questions to presenters in real time. The briefing was recorded and made available on DECAL's RTT-ELC website and published on DECAL's social media channels (YouTube, Facebook, Twitter) for dissemination to a broader audience.

---

## **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.*

In 2014, Georgia supported and accelerated the state's RTT-ELC plan through statute, budgeting priorities, and executive order.

### **Legislation**

- **HB 697:** The passage of this bill in 2014 will pay full tuition for the state's highest achieving technical college students, including those pursuing pre-baccalaureate degrees in early childhood education. A majority of the credentials earned by the child care workforce are earned from one of Georgia's

technical colleges. This bill will help ensure the ECE workforce has the financial resources to pursue higher education.

## **Budget**

- **Increased investment in Georgia's Pre-K Program**

The state saw an increase in revenue from the Georgia Lottery, which resulted in an additional \$12M investment in Georgia's Pre-K Program, for a total of \$311,573,630 to support universal prekindergarten for the state's four year olds.

- **Strategic Industry Workforce Development Grant**

For the second year in a row, the state budget also prioritized early childhood education as a degree field and included it as part of Georgia's Strategic Industries Workforce Development Grant (SIWEDG). Because of this prioritization, students in early childhood education programs of study at institutions in the Technical College System of Georgia were eligible for additional financial assistance of up to \$500 for each term of enrollment.

- **Early Head Start Child Care Partnership Grant**

Year One of the RTT-ELC also brought the news that DECAL was a preliminary awardee of an Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grant of up to \$22M over five years. The innovative model the state proposed will allow many of the innovations of the RTT-ELC work, such as expanded child screening, family engagement, and professional development to be scaled in two high need geographic clusters.

- **Applied for additional MIECHV funding**

The Department of Human Services (DHS), Division of Family and Children Services, Office of Prevention and Family Support is the designated lead agency for MIECHV and a RTT-ELC Participating State Agency. Using MIECHV formula and previous expansion grant funding, Georgia has developed a comprehensive, community-based maternal and early childhood system, Great Start Georgia, and the infrastructure necessary to operate effectively in challenged community contexts. DHS applied for MIECHV competitive grant funding to expand the evidence-based home visiting case load in five of seven currently funded at-risk counties; to implement or expand an early childhood system with evidence-based home visiting in five new counties; and to support the supplemental infrastructure necessary for project management, central intake, technical assistance and training, evaluation, and data/information systems. In addition, DHS applied for formula funding to support the continuation of the Great Start Georgia (GSG) framework in seven at-risk communities.

## **Executive Orders**

- **Child Welfare Reform Council**

In March 2014, Governor Deal announced the creation of the Child Welfare Reform Council to conduct a comprehensive review of the Division of Family and Children Services and advise the Governor on possible executive agency reforms and legislative fixes. The council, composed of leaders in health care, law enforcement, education, and government, met six times throughout 2014; they will complete their review in January 2015. Several pieces of legislation are expected to be introduced during the 2015 legislative session to address the Commission's findings.

While the above bills, executive orders, and budget adjustments will positively impact early learning at the state and local levels, they will not require Georgia's RTT-ELC State Plan to be amended. .

---

## Participating State Agencies

---

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

Overall, there have been no significant changes in participation by or commitment of any of the Participating State Agencies as proposed in Georgia's RTT-ELC grant. During Year One of the RTT-ELC grant, project plans and timelines have been refined to ensure that project delivery is optimally aligned with the entities best suited to support the grant activities.

## 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—

<b>(1) Early Learning &amp; Development Standards</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Early Learning &amp; Development Standards that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>A Comprehensive Assessment System that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Early Childhood Educator qualifications that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

Developing and Adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS)  
(Continued)

<b>(4) Family engagement strategies</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Family engagement strategies that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(5) Health promotion practices</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Health promotion practices that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

<b>(6) Effective data practices</b>	
Yes or No	Yes
<b>Effective data practices that currently apply to:</b>	
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:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓



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.*

Quality Rated, Georgia's Tiered Quality Rated and Improvement System, is the foundation and catalyst for the state's ambitious reform agenda. The program launched in 2012 and in 2014, the first year of ELC implementation, the state began the revision process. Revisions were made that: 1) streamlined the enrollment process; 2) expanded annual renewal options for providers; 3) reduced the paperwork required for certain structural standards, and 4) produced a jargon-free, "provider friendly" manual. The revisions were based on provider feedback and other validation efforts. As validation efforts continue to expand, the state is reviewing additional revisions for 2015. These revisions are in conjunction with the implementation of a new Quality Rated communication plan.

Over the course of Year One of RTT-ELC, the state revised Quality Rated with an official September launch of Quality Rated 2.0. Revisions streamlined certain processes and better facilitated continuous quality improvement throughout the rating process and after programs had been rated. The following strategies were used to identify revisions and to implement changes to Quality Rated:

- 1) Conducted on-going focus groups with early learning directors and teachers, family child care providers, technical assistance providers, and other key stakeholders;
- 2) Convened a Quality Rated Policy Committee composed of DECAL executive leadership to review all Quality Rated policies and procedures and discuss ongoing implementation strategies;
- 3) Reviewed the Quality Rated manual to better communicate the requirements of the program; and
- 4) Adopted continual research-to-policy feedback loops that use validation efforts to inform the revision process.

The following describes the major revision efforts completed in 2014:

**Enrollment** – The application for enrolling in Quality Rated was shortened, and the process for approving enrollment was streamlined. This reduced barriers for many programs and allowed the state to approve applications quickly. By doing so, programs were able to start the portfolio process soon after applying.

**Expanded Renewal Options for Programs** – Previously programs were rated every three years. Additionally, programs had to renew annually to remain rated. To renew, the programs had to revise the portfolio they had created the previous year. If programs wanted to be "re-rated" to achieve a higher star level, the program had to shoulder the expense of additional observations. Many program directors reported that the annual renewal process was burdensome and did not facilitate continuous program improvement. Therefore, the state substantially revised the annual renewal process to give programs options. The first option is for programs to

simply maintain the rating. The program will report any changes to the demographics of the program, but they do not have to revise their portfolio (though they may do so voluntarily). The second option is for programs to apply for a continuous quality improvement award related to one of the standards. Programs choosing this option are not “re-rated,” but they are able to identify and work on areas of growth. This will benefit their future ratings. It is also a way for 3-star programs to continue to improve their quality. The third option is for programs to be re-rated to achieve a higher star level - but not at their own expense. Programs revise their portfolio and, if the portfolio meets specific scoring criteria, an observation is scheduled to complete the re-rating process. (The portfolio cut scores were identified through validation.) This provides programs with an option to not have to wait three years to receive a new rating. It is important to note that programs that select the first or second options will undergo the rating process in three years.

**Reduced the Paperwork Required for Certain Standards** – Providers reported that the process related to two standards (professional development and ratios) were taking longer than expected and using time that should be used to raise classroom quality. Furthermore, technical assistance providers reported that they were spending more time helping programs submit their portfolios and not enough time coaching teachers in classrooms. Therefore, the amount of paperwork required to report ratios was reduced, and providers were given flexibility in reporting on the professional development for newly hired staff. This recognized the reality of higher staff turnover for some programs. (The state is also working on resolving some of the technical issues associated with entering credentials and training in the state's professional development registry to reduce the reporting burden).

**Produced a Jargon-Free “Provider Friendly” Manual** – One of the successes of Year One of the RTT-ELC was the production of the new Quality Rated program manual. The new manual was more explicit in describing the requirements and clearer in the description of each standard and why that standard was important. The state also established guidelines for additional revisions as issues arise.

The above-mentioned strategies were successful in identifying and implementing Quality Rated revisions. The revisions streamlined processes and allowed programs to spend time on classroom level efforts that benefit programs, families, and children. The state is expanding validation efforts in Year Two that will include direct provider feedback. Additionally, the Quality Rated Policy Committee continues to meet to ensure alignment and to facilitate an environment that strengthens Quality Rated and thereby raises quality.

---

## 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 Year One of RTT-ELC, the state made significant progress in recruiting programs to Quality Rated, even surpassing its target. Specifically, 1,779 programs were enrolled at the end of the year, exceeding the target of 1,755 by 24 programs. A program that has successfully applied to enroll in Quality Rated is considered participating. Once a program is enrolled, the program completes a portfolio and is observed using an appropriate Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-R, ITERS-R, FCCERS-R). The scores of the portfolio and the observation are combined to issue a rating (1-, 2-, or 3-stars). While both the portfolio and the observation are considered in the rating, the observation is more heavily weighted than the portfolio.

Year One recruitment efforts focused on licensed child care learning centers and family day care homes. Since approximately 50% of Georgia's Pre-K programs were located in licensed child care learning centers, the state was able to exceed the preschool target of 25%; by December 31, 2014 over 32% of Georgia's Pre-K classrooms were located in a program participating in Quality Rated. Similar results were documented for programs receiving Head Start and Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) subsidies. The target for both was 25% with year-end participation rates at approximately 46% for Head Start and 32% for CCDF. In subsequent years, the state will continue to develop and implement strategies to recruit programs not located in licensed child care learning centers or Head Start programs, such as IDEA Part B and Part C classrooms located in public schools.

### Recruitment Strategies

The state exponentially ramped up recruitment efforts in the last quarter of the year. On September 4, only 1,336 programs were enrolled in Quality Rated, a deficit of 443 programs from the Year One target. To meet the Year One goals, a multi-pronged approach for recruitment was immediately implemented. This approach included the following strategies:

- The enrollment process was streamlined. This streamlining made it easier for child care programs and family day care homes to enroll in Quality Rated.
- A personal letter from the Commissioner of the Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL) was emailed to all licensed programs with a four-year history of compliance with the state's licensing rules. The letter encouraged the programs to enroll in Quality Rated. DECAL has a robust compliance determination system and programs with a four-year history of compliance have demonstrated an overall commitment to consistently meet the state's health and safety rules.
- Information about Quality Rated was added to all electronic communications issued to programs from DECAL, including child care license fee payment notices and subsidy payment remittance notices.
- As part of the renewal of the contracts with the child care resource and referral agencies, two new quarterly performance measures were established. The first measure specifically addressed recruitment. Each child care resource and referral agency was given quarterly targets for the next federal fiscal year. The measures were developed based on the proportion of programs in the region already participating and the percentage of programs that each child care resource and referral agency has in their region. The child care resource and referral agencies were provided monthly updates. Georgia has six child care resource and referral regions. The following table reports the recruitment targets and actual recruitment numbers over the course of the fourth quarter. The measures are broken out by child care learning centers and family day care homes:

R&R Region	October 1-December 31			Targets: December 31			% Completed		
	Ctr	Fam	Total	Ctr	Fam	Total	Ctr	Fam	Total
Region 1 - North	44	24	68	36	29	65	112%	83%	105%
Region 2 - Metro	39	16	55	46	35	81	85%	46%	68%
Region 3 - Central	35	26	61	26	29	55	135%	90%	111%
Region 4 - Southwest	31	22	53	27	31	58	115%	71%	91%
Region 5 - Southeast	41	37	78	37	36	73	111%	103%	107%
Region 6 - East	29	15	44	24	26	50	121%	58%	88%
<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>112%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>94%</b>

- The state developed an innovative recruitment process for the state's licensing and monitoring staff (Child Care Services consultants). These staff monitor all licensed child care learning centers and family day care homes at least twice a year. The consultants used their planned licensing and monitoring visits to encourage programs with a history of licensing compliance for four consecutive years to enroll in Quality Rated. At the end of the licensing and monitoring visits, the consultants asked the providers/directors if they were familiar with Quality Rated and provided information about enrolling. To begin this process, the state did the following:
  - Designed this strategy as a “Quality Rated recruitment challenge” with goals and low-cost incentives. Incentives included a suspension of “intake” duties for six months (consultants rotate intake duties throughout the year. Intake includes phone monitoring, registering complaints, etc.) and offered attendance at national professional development conferences.
  - Provided licensing consultants with additional information about Quality Rated. A webinar was held in early September that provided details about the recruitment challenge and gave consultants the needed information to sell Quality Rated to programs.
  - Informed each child care resource and referral agency of the four-year compliant programs that had been visited the previous week. The child care resource and referral agencies followed up with those programs.
  - Distributed a list of four-year compliant programs to consultants, managers, and directors on a weekly basis.
  - Measured the progress of the challenge. Specifically, a program that enrolled in Quality Rated within ten days of the licensing/monitoring visit was “counted” as a licensing “recruited” program. Findings were reviewed on a weekly basis by the ELC grant management, validation team, and child care services managers and directors. At the end of the challenge, the results were analyzed and shared. In the quarter before the challenge, 0.4% (n=4) programs enrolled in Quality Rated within ten days of a licensing visit. For the quarter of the challenge, 3.4% (n=51) of programs enrolled within 10 days. This is an increase of 680%.
  - Surveyed the licensing consultants during and after the challenge. During the challenge, Quality Rated managers conducted a telephone focus group with several consultants. At the end of the quarter, a survey was distributed to all licensing consultants. The survey had a response rate of approximately 60%. The table below lists the key results. Each question was scored with the following scale (0 = strongly disagree, 1 = disagree, 2 = neither agree nor disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree).

<b>Statement</b>	<b># of respondents:</b>	<b>% Strongly Agree or Agree:</b>	<b>Average (0-4 Scale)</b>
<i>I like talking to child care providers about Quality Rated.</i>	53	66%	3.87
<i>Providers are receptive to my inquiries of their Quality Rated participation.</i>	53	64%	3.72
<i>Bringing up the topic of Quality Rated created a positive moment during my licensing visit.</i>	53	55%	3.76
<i>I am comfortable talking to child care providers about Quality Rated during licensing visits.</i>	53	72%	3.86
<i>I feel adequately prepared to recruit child care providers to Quality Rated.</i>	52	54%	3.52

- Developed a plan for continuing and expanding the recruitment challenge. Consultants will continue to recruit four-year compliant programs while DECAL develops mechanisms for consultants to view the progress of participating programs in preparing their Quality Rated portfolios. Based on the survey results, additional Quality Rated information is also being shared with licensing consultants regularly.

Georgia met the state's overall participation target in Year One, and met most of the subgroup participation targets with the exception of Part B, Section 619 programs. By employing the specific strategies in the fourth quarter, the recruitment goals were exceeded. While each of the four strategies above is important, the key to the state's success was the way that each of four strategies aligns with the other. For example, the recruitment challenge efforts by the licensing consultants helped the child care resource and referral agencies with the recruitment performance measures in the contract. The follow-up contacts by the child care resource and referral agencies after the licensing consultants' visits to the four-year compliant programs reinforced the efforts. This aligned recruitment approach ensured consistency in the message provided to programs. Coupling these strategies with encouragement from DECAL's Commissioner and the streamlined enrollment process (both of which were referenced by the licensing/monitoring consultant), the state was able to meet the first year recruitment measures and prepare for continued recruitment in Year Two.

Year One recruitment numbers were higher for child care learning centers than for family day care homes. While this is similar to challenges facing other states, Georgia plans on employing additional recruitment activities targeting family day care homes in Year Two. DECAL will add staff dedicated to family day care homes in the child care resource and referral agencies and employ a state-level staff person specifically to work with each child care resource and referral in recruiting family day care homes (among other duties). The state will also increase validation efforts and focus groups among family day care homes.

Quality Rated recruitment involves a numerical challenge worth noting. Traditionally, the percentage of programs recruited would be a better measure (slightly over 30% at the end of 2014). However, the number of licensed programs in Georgia continues to decline. When Georgia submitted the Early Learning Challenge application in October 2013, there were over 6,300 programs. As of December 31, 2014, there are less than 5,400 programs. Due to this decrease, the increase in the number of programs participating is a better gauge of

the state's success than an increase in the percentage of programs participating. With the decline this percentage would increase even without active recruitment. The state is keeping the current numerical targets. With an improving economy and other Early Learning Challenge efforts, DECAL hopes that the number of programs will start to increase.

In summary, the state increased recruitment efforts and successfully exceeded the participating targets for Year One. These efforts primarily focused on programs that are licensed (child care learning centers and family day care homes). In subsequent years, the state will employ strategies for recruiting programs that are not licensed (Georgia's Pre-K in public schools, programs funded by IDEA Part B and C). The state is also revising the communication plan for Quality Rated with messages specifically tailored to providers and to families. DECAL's goal is that the messages to families will provide them with enough information about quality child care that they will ask providers about their participation in Quality Rated and encourage them to enroll. Most importantly for Year One, the increase in recruitment efforts has set the stage for continued success in achieving 100% participation by Year Four.

**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	433	23.90%	452	25.00%	905	50.00%	1,357	85.00%	1,809	100.00%
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	48	14.10%	85	25.00%	171	50.00%	256	75.00%	324	95.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	0.00%	86	20.00%	216	50.00%	308	70.00%	350	81.20%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	775	23.50%	825	25.00%	1,649	50.00%	2,474	75.00%	3,298	100.00%

<sup>1</sup> 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	1,809	433	23.90%	1,816	598	32.90%			
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program								
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	341	48	14.10%	325	151	46.50%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	431	-	0.00%	999	17	1.70%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	3,298	775	23.50%	3,825	1,242	32.50%			

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Actuals						
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool						
Specify:						
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds						

<sup>1</sup> 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.

Pre-K: Baseline and participating program counts are actual (2014-2015 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2014). At the time the baseline was reported, there were 1,809 Georgia's Pre-K programs in the



state, of whom 433 were participating in the TQRIS. In year one, there was an increase to 1,816 Georgia's Pre-K programs, of whom 598 were participating in the TQRIS.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Number of programs in the state is actual, from 2013-2014 Program Information Report. Number of programs in Quality Rated is actual to the best of our knowledge; however, Early Head Start and Head Start site data do not match perfectly to Georgia's licensing data, and some assumptions have to be made on a program's Head Start status (e.g., whether a program is fully operated by or only collaborates with a Head Start grantee).

IDEA, Part C does not fund programs directly in Georgia.

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia's Pre-K programs uses 619 funding to place a special education teacher in 98 inclusion classrooms statewide in the current school year; 17 of these are in Quality Rated programs. Georgia Department of Education reports 999 schools use Part B, section 619 funding for preschool special education (October 2014 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System [FTE 2015-1]). Based on information recently received from the Georgia Department of Education, a more accurate baseline count is that there were 984 schools with preschool special education services in October 2013 (FTE 2014-1), not 431 as originally reported.

Title I of ESEA: Title I preschool classes in Georgia have been converted into Georgia's Pre-K classes; school districts use Title I funds to supplement their Georgia's Pre-K classes.

CCDF: Programs participating in Quality Rated out of total programs that received a CCDF subsidy payment for services to children in November or December of 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.*

The state exceeded its targets across all types of programs except for Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, Section 619. As detailed in the narrative, the state spent Year One focused on recruiting programs who could participate in Quality Rated utilizing existing supports. In Year Two, the state will develop protocols and resources to better meet the needs of unique populations of programs who are going through the Quality Rated process.

---

## 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.*

### **Rating Programs**

Georgia has a robust system for rating and monitoring the quality of programs participating in its TQRIS. The rating process includes submitting a portfolio of self-reported data related to five standards and undergoing an independent observation using one of the Environment Rating Scales. This is coupled with additional monitoring visits from child care consultants (at least twice a year for licensed child care learning centers and family day care homes), and visits from consultants representing Georgia's Pre-K Program and the Child and Adult Care Food Program if appropriate. After a program has been rated, the monitoring process includes an annual "check-in" renewal for two years followed by a new rating every three years. Programs have the option of being "re-rated" before the three years if they can demonstrate measureable quality improvement.

At the time of the state's Early Learning Challenge application, approximately 230 programs had been rated. By December 31, 2014 approximately 424 programs were rated (the number of rated programs does not include those programs that went through the rating process but did not score enough points to achieve a star rating). Considering that the 230 programs were rated over a two-year process, the 194 rated program increase represents success for the state. During Year One of the RTT-ELC grant, Georgia focused on hiring additional Quality Rated assessors to complete the observations. Georgia also used RTT-ELC funding to provide additional resources to each of Georgia's six child care resource and referral agencies to hire two new staff members per region to provide technical assistance to child care providers in completing the Quality Rated process.

While the state made substantial progress in rating programs, the number falls short of the application target of 835 rated programs. Several reasons explain why the state did not meet the targets:

- The average time period for programs to be rated is over 12 months. Therefore, the programs recruited in 2014 were not ready to be rated during the current year.
- The revisions for Quality Rated were not implemented until the fourth quarter of 2014. Therefore, only programs recruited after September 20, 2014 are participating under the revised processes.
- While the state was able to meet the 90-day period from portfolio submission to observation, the state has encountered some challenges in recruiting qualified observers. While this did not impact the rated numbers in 2014, without having a sufficient number of raters in place for much of the year, DECAL did not encourage accelerated portfolio submissions.
- A couple of Quality Rated's foundational principles are that programs determine when they submit their portfolio and there is no time limit within which programs must submit. Many programs have elected not to submit until they are confident they will be rated a 2- or 3-star. While part of DECAL's message has been that just being rated signifies to families a commitment to quality, many programs are still hesitant to submit.

In Year Two (and Three/Four), DECAL is addressing each of the above challenges through the following strategies:

- DECAL has streamlined the administratively burdensome components of the portfolio process. These revisions were based on provider feedback obtained in focus groups earlier in the year. This streamlining should reduce the time between enrolling and portfolio submission. Early estimates indicate that this will reduce the average time from over 12 months to six-nine months. The specific revisions include: 1) reducing the paperwork for reporting ratios and group sizes; 2) decreasing the percentage of teachers that must be enrolled in the Professional Development Registry to mirror employment trends. Both of these changes ensure that programs can focus on quality enhancement and will reduce the time it takes to complete a portfolio.
- DECAL has incorporated portfolio submission measures in the contracts with child care resource and referral agencies. Georgia's child care resource and referral agencies provide technical assistance to participating programs. It is now expected that technical assistance will not exceed, on average, six months. While this has been a paradigm shift for some of the child care resource and referral agencies, they have been able to begin meeting these measures through better use of data, creating new technical assistance processes that simultaneously meet the needs of multiple providers, and incorporating a teamwork approach. This new measure, along with the recruitment measure, was newly adopted for the fourth quarter, and there was wide variation among the child care resource and referral agencies in meeting the measure. Those that met the measure are providing assistance to those who did not meet it.
- As of December 31, 2014, DECAL has a full staff of qualified observers across the state, and DECAL continues to recruit. The full staff includes additional supervisors who are assisting with reliability, an observer who will work with each child care resource and referral agency, and reliable observers with each ERS instrument. As the programs that were recruited begin to submit portfolios (under the streamlined process), DECAL staff will be able to meet the 90-day window between portfolio acceptance and observation. The increased staff also includes additional portfolio reviewers.

- DECAL is working with additional communication resources on the messaging related to Quality Rated. Through active listening and the engagement of feedback loops with all Quality Rated stakeholders, DECAL expects the messages detailing the importance of being rated to take hold, and more providers will be comfortable with submitting earlier.

Based on the increased recruitment numbers in Year One, DECAL fully expects to meet the rated targets in subsequent years.

### **Summary**

Georgia has implemented a strong process for measuring quality. This process includes portfolio submission followed by an independent observation. As a result of recruitment efforts being delayed and a longer period (at least initially) between enrolling and portfolio submission, the state was not able to rate as many programs as intended; however, the state has made and will continue to implement strategies to meet the ELC targets. The state has been able to monitor the distribution of levels and compare that to earlier estimations and previous research that utilized representative sampling.

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

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

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

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
3

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	16	0	1	0		15	4
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	2	0	0	0		3	0

**Optional Notes - State TQRIS Tiers/Levels**

Explain missing data. If program movement up or down is not tracked by program type in the TQRIS you can provide the Total Programs that Moved Up and Total Programs that Moved Down in this optional notes box.

Georgia's Pre-K programs (Georgia's state-funded preschool program) may be located within licensed center-based child care programs as well as within public schools or other government facilities. As a result, there is some duplication in program counts between state-funded preschool, Head Start, and center-based programs receiving CCDF. Specifically, one state-funded preschool program that moved up at least one level is also a Head Start program, 15 state-funded preschool programs that moved up at least one level are also center-based

programs receiving CCDF, and two state-funded preschool programs that moved down at least one level are also center-based programs receiving CCDF.

Furthermore, there are programs participating in the TQRIS that do not fall into any of the categories reported above. Of these, four family child care programs moved up at least one level, while one moved down at least one level.

In all (using unduplicated counts), 24 programs in Quality Rated moved up at least one level and 4 moved down at least one level in 2014.

IDEA, Part C does not fund programs directly in Georgia. No programs funded under IDEA, Part B, section 619 moved up or down a level. School districts in Georgia use Title I of ESEA funds to supplement their Georgia's Pre-K classes rather than to fund separate early learning programs.

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

<b>High-Quality Benchmarks at the Highest Level(s) of the TQRIS</b>	
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 creation of Quality Rated, Georgia's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, was based on the work of a large stakeholder committee that identified high standards for early education in the state and a research study that measured programs ability to meet those previously identified standards across a representative sample. Therefore, those standards at the highest level (3-stars) are those that state experts deemed as important and were shown to be both ambitious and achievable for providers. State leaders recognize the importance of continual measurement of QRIS standards and have incorporated into validation efforts activities designed to ensure that they are high-quality benchmarks able to differentiate the highest levels of quality in Georgia's system.

In Year One, the state conducted focus groups with providers to gauge their perceptions of the standards. The providers felt that the items measured in the Environment Rating Scales (ECERS-R, ITERS-R, FCCERS-R) truly differentiated those higher levels of quality. Concurrently, the state was continually measuring the distribution of ratings as more programs became rated. While neither of these efforts provide concrete findings that the benchmarks at level 3 measure higher quality, they do inform future efforts to do so.

**Distribution of Rated Programs**

In Georgia's RTT-ELC application, the state forecasted the percentage of programs which would be rated at a 1-, 2-, and 3-star. Specifically, the state provided estimates based on the breakdown at the time of the application (38%, 35%, and 27% respectively) with an increase in the percentage of 1-star and a decrease of 2- and 3-stars (assuming that higher quality programs were earlier adopters and based on percentages found in the 2009 statewide representative study of quality). The following table details the breakdown at the time of the

application, the forecasted percentages, and the percentage as of December 31, 2014. It is important to note that the breakdowns combine both child care learning centers and family day care homes.

	<b>Baseline: ELC Application 2013</b>	<b>Forecasted</b>	<b>Actual: December 31, 2014</b>
1-Star	38%	46%	25%
2-Star	35%	42%	46%
3-Star	27%	11%	29%

As the table demonstrates, the initial estimates overestimated the number of 1-star programs, while underestimated the number of 2- and 3-star programs. This implies any of the following: 1) early adopters are higher quality; 2) the technical assistance process is helping programs enter the rating system at higher levels; 3) the quality of early care and education has substantially improved since 2009; 4) the Quality Rated process is overestimating quality; or 5) a combination of the above. As detailed in subsequent sections, Quality Rated validation efforts are designed to “tease out” the reasons for the distribution. The state is currently conducting different analyses and subsequent validation processes will help answer this question.

In Year Two, the state will also launch Quality Rated Inclusion (QRi), which will be an additional mark of distinction for programs already at the 3-star level which demonstrate practices that ensure inclusion of children with special needs. In Years Two, Three, and Four of the grant, the following additional activities will be conducted to gauge the assurance of these benchmarks at the highest level: 1) on-going analyses of the distribution of ratings; 2) additional focus groups with providers as they complete the rating process; 3) review of Georgia's standards and the “cut-offs” within each standard by national and state experts; 4) a study of Georgia's rated programs with instruments not used in the rating process; and 5) a study that aligns child outcomes to star levels. Each of these will build on the work that the state has been doing and will be used to inform additional revisions-the next of which is planned for July 2015.



## 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.

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	1,126	1,755	2,734	4,262	6,642	1,779			
Number of Programs in Tier 1	88	388	793	1,402	1,993	106			
Number of Programs in Tier 2	80	353	722	1,346	2,657	195			
Number of Programs in Tier 3	62	94	274	544	996	123			

#### 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.

Count of Quality Rated participants and their rating levels as of December 31, 2014, from Quality Rated data system. Since these data are maintained in the TQRIS data system (e.g., a program is not at tier 3 until it is assigned that level within the data system), no further data collection methodology is required other than retrieving the data from the data system. In addition to star-rated programs in the three tiers reported above, 191 programs were to be rated in the first quarter of 2015, 12 programs had gone through the rating process but failed to earn a star level, and 1,152 participating programs were in varying stages of the process to prepare for a rating, for a total of 1,355 additional participating programs. These 1,355 programs are included in the total number of programs covered by the TQRIS but do not fall into the three tiers.

#### 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.

Because it takes approximately six to nine months for programs to complete the Quality Rated process and to be eligible for an observation on the ERS which triggers the actual rating, it was impossible for the state to translate recruitment and participation numbers into rated numbers during Year One of the grant. However, because the state has taken steps to streamline the Quality Rated process and exceeded its recruitment goals in Year One, the state anticipates being able to meet the goals for Year Two.

**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	1,800	3.60%	5,050	10.00%	10,099	20.00%	17,674	35.00%	25,248	50.00%
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	520	2.00%	2,540	10.00%	5,079	20.00%	8,880	35.00%	12,698	50.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	1,236	2.00%	6,086	10.00%	12,172	20.00%	21,300	35.00%	30,429	50.00%

<sup>1</sup> 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	50,496	1,800	3.60%	46,227	3,454	7.50%			
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program								
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	25,396	520	2.00%	23,682	2,671	11.30%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	7,519	-	0.00%	8,185	-	0.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	8,974	-	0.00%	9,481	-	0.00%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	60,858	1,236	2.00%	61,278	4,075	6.70%			

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Actuals						
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool						
Specify:						
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds						

<sup>1</sup> 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.*

Pre-K: Georgia's Pre-K is a universal program, not targeted to special populations, and does not collect child income data nor home language data. The total number of children with high needs in Georgia's Pre-K is an estimate based on counting all enrolled children who were marked as having an IEP, having limited English proficiency, or participating in a means-tested benefit, as reported by grantee programs to the state in roster 2 data for the 2014-2015 school year. This count, while actual, is only approximate to the definition of children with high needs. By this method, it is estimated that 57.4% of all Georgia's Pre-K students are children with high needs. PeachCare, Georgia's Child Health Insurance Program, was removed from the means-tested benefit data collected by Georgia's Pre-K beginning in the 2013-2014 school year because it was decided that its relatively higher income threshold (235% of the federal poverty level at the time, and since increased to 247% of the federal poverty level) did not best identify children from low-income families. As a result, the highest possible benefit eligibility that was counted for Georgia's Pre-K students dropped from 235% of the federal poverty level to 185% for students in school systems (free and reduced lunch) and 149% for students in private programs (Medicaid). This explains why the number of children with high needs served in Georgia's Pre-K appears to have dropped from the baseline.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Total is actual count of funded enrollment (2013-2014 Program Information Report). Children in top tiers of quality is an estimate based on program's self-reported data at time of application. Some assumptions have to be made matching Head Start sites to Quality Rated and licensing data, such as whether programs with a similar, but not identical, name or address in the Head Start Program Information Report and in Quality Rated program data are indeed the same program.

IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619: Part C number of children is December 1, 2013, federal data count. Part B, section 619 count is from October 2014 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System. Federal law prohibits IDEA Parts C and B funded programs from sharing information about children receiving services. Families are encouraged to share this information with their early learning and development programs but cannot be required to do so. The numbers reported in the actuals chart is the total number served statewide by Part B, Section 619, and Part C. Neither the actuals chart nor the targets chart reports numbers in top tiers of the TQRIS. We have aggregate counts for how many children are served in IDEA statewide, but we are not able to identify these children within specific early learning programs. Georgia did not submit (B)(4)(c)(2) performance measures for Part B or C on our original ELC application in 2013, with the following explanation: "Federal law prohibits IDEA Parts C and B funded programs from sharing information about children receiving services. Families are encouraged to share this information with their early learning and development programs but cannot be required to do so. Thus Georgia is unable to track participation in Quality Rated programs by children with IEPs and IFSPs.

Title I of ESEA: Title I preschool classes in Georgia have been converted into Georgia's Pre-K classes; school districts use Title I funds to supplement their Georgia's Pre-K classes.

CCDF: Number of children served in providers receiving CCDF payment in November 2014 who were rated at 2- or 3-stars by year end. December child counts are lower due to time of year, whereas November counts are more typical.

**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.*

As detailed in the narrative, the state spent Year One focused on recruiting programs who could participate in Quality Rated utilizing existing supports. In Year Two, the state will develop protocols and resources to better meet the needs of unique populations of programs who are going through the Quality Rated process. Through the Quality Rated Policy committee, the state will develop policy modifications, vetted through groups of subpopulation stakeholders and experts and implemented through the technical assistance of the Child Care Resource and Referral Network. This will ensure the state meets its goals regarding subpopulations.

---

## 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.*

Validation has been integrated as part of the day-to-day management of Quality Rated since its development. Two key components to Georgia's success are the mechanisms that Georgia has put in place for validation to inform policy and practice, and the institution of procedures where these mechanisms will continue throughout the grant.

To that end, Georgia made significant progress on validation efforts in year one. During this first year, DECAL:

1. Established structures to support validation (e.g., external experts and agency staff identified key questions and helped interpret administrative data).
2. Established feedback loops within the agency between researchers and Quality Rated staff. This structure will help ensure that data and research learnings will be shared quickly with the Quality Rated team so that modifications can be made, as needed.
3. Explored Quality Rated administrative data to examine basic aspects of validity such as the distributions of ratings and the percentage of programs meeting each quality indicator.
4. Reviewed reliability procedures for Quality Rated portfolios and observations and created new procedures or revised procedures, as needed, to strengthen the reliability of the Quality Rated data.
5. Helped address priority evaluation questions like recruitment and the rating process. These questions include:
  - a. How many programs have applied for a rating? Is the number increasing?
  - b. How many programs have completed their portfolios statewide? By region?
  - c. How long does it take programs to complete the portfolio? Does it take higher rated programs longer? Do the data suggest the need to revise the portfolio?

The following discusses the methodological approaches that Georgia has used for these activities:

1. Research Methods and Analyses: Over the course of the year, DECAL has engaged in a variety of methods and analyses in the validation process. The purpose of these activities is to inform, on an ongoing basis, Quality Rated policy and practice. These activities include:
  - Hosting provider focus groups and using providers' feedback to design validation questions and inform policy decisions.
  - Conducting statistical analyses related to star-level distribution, participation rates, and completion times. These analyses are revised and rerun as new data become available.
  - Interviewing child care resource and referral agency directors about the newly implemented performance measures and evaluating if the performance measures are having the desired impact of reducing completion times.

- Aligning validation activities with other state early learning projects to facilitate research-to-policy feedback loops. For example, analyses related to access are being used in designing several activities in the Early Education Empowerment Zones.
2. Validation Meetings: As part of the ongoing validation efforts, DECAL instituted weekly meetings with internal staff and quarterly external meetings with key stakeholders and researchers. Both meetings began in July 2014 and met according to schedule.
- The internal Quality Rated validation group consists of Early Learning Challenge management, including the Deputy Commissioner for System Reform, DECAL's research and evaluation unit, the evaluator from the Governor's Office of Student Achievement, Quality Rated's management team, and representatives from DECAL's IT division. The purpose of the group is to design and review ongoing validation research and share results with the Quality Rated Policy Committee (a separate group of all DECAL leadership that reviews all Quality Rated policies - see Section B(1)).
  - The external validation team was also created to review the ongoing validation work and make recommendations in a larger policy context. This team consists of representatives from other state agencies, managers from each RTT-ELC project, researchers representing various universities, and representatives from philanthropic and advocacy groups. The external validation team will continue to meet quarterly throughout the grant.
  - Both validation teams help facilitate feedback loops between research and policy/practice. For example, the internal team conducted and reviewed analyses related to recruitment and movement through the Quality Rated system. The findings and conclusions from these analyses were presented to the Quality Rated Policy Committee for recommendations for the resource and referral performance measures. These measures were enacted and will inform recruitment and rating throughout the grant period.
3. Reliability: A critical component of Georgia's validation effort involves ensuring consistency for both the observations and portfolios.
- Throughout year one, DECAL's staff worked with Quality Rated management to review and develop reliability protocols for the Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-R, ITERS-R, FCCERS-R) observations. Each observer completes an intense training protocol that results in observations where she/he must be reliable at an average of 85% over three consecutive visits. Reliability checks are conducted with a trained anchor who has demonstrated reliability with an assessor representing the authors of the scales. After training, each observer participates in one reliability check (80% agreement) every six months. This protocol is repeated for each scale for which she/he has been trained. While the time frame is less frequent than some recommendations, it allows for consistency in the reliability checks and does not deter from observations being conducted and programs becoming rated.
  - A similar process is conducted with the portfolios. All portfolio reviewers conduct a portfolio review protocol every three months, where all portfolio reviewers score the same portfolio and must be reliable at 85%.

In summary, Georgia has strengthened the validation mechanisms by employing a variety of research methods and analyses, involving stakeholders, and developing reliability protocols. This includes engaging in research related to Quality Rated using a variety of methods and statistical analyses, weekly and quarterly validation meetings, and ensuring reliability with assessors conducting observations and scoring portfolios. In year two, the state will continue with validation activities to inform further revisions to Quality Rated, validate the star levels with other measures of quality, and begin designing an evaluation that incorporates child outcomes.



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

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

### Focused Investment Areas

- (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.
- (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.
- (C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.
- (C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.
- (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.
- (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.
- (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

## Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

---

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

---

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

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

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

Throughout Year One of the RTT-ELC grant period, Georgia has enlisted a variety of strategies to promote use of the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS). DECAL has promoted broad stakeholder awareness and understanding of the GELDS through increased print resources, presentations at key national and regional conferences, and broadcasts through public and social media channels. For those stakeholders who need support to implement the GELDS, DECAL has developed new, high-quality training modules available both through in-person and online avenues. In 2014, DECAL also sought to ensure that the GELDS are inclusive of the needs of dual-language learners (DLLs), expanded the standards to reflect best practices to support all students, and provided additional training opportunities meeting the needs of DLLs.

#### **Increasing Awareness of the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards**

A key participating state agency in building GELDS awareness is Georgia Public Broadcasting (GPB), the state's PBS affiliate. In partnership with GPB, DECAL has produced 13, 30-second TV spots comprising the "Play to Learn" series. Each spot covers a specific skill outlined in the GELDS, such as early reading, early writing, use of senses, scientific inquiry, etc. The 13 "Play to Learn" spots ran a total of 618 times from July 2014 to the end of Year One. In addition to airing live on GPB as part of the network's regular programming, the spots have also been uploaded to the GELDS YouTube channel, [www.youtube.com/GeorgiaELDS](http://www.youtube.com/GeorgiaELDS).

With RTT-ELC funds, Georgia has also entered into a contract to expand the variety and availability of print resources on the GELDS for specific audiences. This includes the development of a teacher activity toolbox, which is a collection of educator resources aligned with the GELDS developed by teams of ELD teachers. DECAL is currently developing a distribution plan and will begin printing and disseminating these resources in January 2015.

## **Increasing the Availability of High Quality Training**

Increasing the availability of high-quality training on the GELDS has also been a priority. In Year One, GELDS training has been developed for delivery in-person and online. During grant Year One, 149 GELDS training sessions were provided, reaching 3,198 participants.

DECAL contracted with Georgia State University's Best Practices division to develop and deliver a "Train the Trainer" series on the GELDS, including three new courses for in-person delivery:

1. Standards 102: Child Development
2. Standards 103: Developmentally Appropriate Practice
3. Standards 104: Lesson Planning with the GELDS

*Teachers who attend the Standards 104 training will receive and learn how to use the GELDS Teacher Activity Tool Box that is in production.*

Best Practices conducted two "train the trainer" sessions in 2014, one on November 18-19 and the other on December 4-5. A combined total of 60 trainers from across Georgia attended. Trainers received a training manual to deliver all three sessions, PowerPoint presentations for each session, and the materials they need to conduct the sessions with fidelity.

The state also developed additional online GELDS resources for teachers through a contract with the Online Learning Library Initiative (OLLI). The state developed three GELDS lesson planning videos, one each for infant, toddler, and preschool teachers, and they have been posted on OLLI ([www.oli.decal.ga.gov](http://www.oli.decal.ga.gov)) and on the GELDS YouTube channel.

## **Supporting Dual Language Learners**

In Year One, Georgia partnered with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium to incorporate the Early English Language (E-ELD) standards into the GELDS to provide a developmentally sound framework for supporting, instructing, and assessing dual language learners (DLLs), ages 2.5-5.5 years. In 2014, Georgia formally adopted the WIDA Early Language Development Standards; WIDA is in the process of finalizing a correspondence document between the GELDS and their E-ELDS. In October 2014, DECAL hosted a kick-off event with WIDA to formally launch the partnership to the public and share information about the state's plan to support young dual language learners. The attendees included a cross-sector mix of stakeholders, including representatives from higher education, technical assistance providers, state agencies, subject matter experts, and community representatives.

At the kick-off event, the state also announced the application process for the WIDA Master Cadre training, which is an opportunity for stakeholders to learn about WIDA's Early English Language Development Standards Framework and how to use these standards to support, instruct, and assess young DLLs (ages 2.5 to 5.5 years) in early education programs. Though there were only 30 spaces available in the first cadre, the state received over 70 applications. Applications were reviewed by a steering committee and those selected for the first Master Cadre were notified in December. The first Master Cadre will begin with a two-day workshop in January 2015. Participants will complete online modules/distance learning over seven months that will culminate with a capstone event in July 2015. A second Master Cadre will begin in the fall of 2015.

## Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application)

*Has the State made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to:*

Comprehensive Assessment Systems	
Select assessment instruments and approaches that are appropriate for the target populations and purposes	Yes
Strengthen Early Childhood Educators' understanding of the purposes and uses of each type of assessment included in the Comprehensive Assessment Systems	Yes
Articulate an approach for aligning and integrating assessments and sharing assessment results	Yes
Train Early Childhood Educators to appropriately administer assessments and interpret and use assessment data in order to inform and improve instruction, programs, and services	Yes

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

Georgia has continued working on components of a Comprehensive Assessment System. In Year One of the state's RTT-ELC grant, Georgia strengthened cross-sector understanding of the purposes and uses of assessment, as well as appropriate administration of assessment tools, and began to plan for implementation at the program level during grant years two.

### **Comprehensive Assessment Task Force**

In September 2014, DECAL and the Georgia Department of Public Health (DPH) convened the Comprehensive Assessment Task Force for Birth to Five to engage over 40 experts from Georgia's college/universities, school systems, early childhood programs, the medical community, and state agencies to review current screening and formative assessment practices and related professional development resources. The state entered into a contract with Georgia State University's Health Policy Center to facilitate the task force, which is co-chaired by the two agencies. At the kick-off meeting, DECAL and DPH provided an overview of the RTT-ELC grant, the task force established developmental and formative assessment subcommittees, and laid a plan to accomplish their work to inform statewide policy, coordinate child assessment efforts, and support effective professional development.

The developmental and formative subcommittees met twice in 2014. They established common definitions, identified tasks, and outlined a process for obtaining additional information about current practices in the state which includes disseminating a survey instrument to determine formative and developmental screening practices among partners. The full task force and subcommittees will continue to meet through 2015 to conduct and analyze the survey on assessment practices in the state and move forward with a more comprehensive review of national best practices. Ultimately, the task force will develop a set of guidelines and support for using a common set of assessments statewide.

### **Implementation of Developmental Screening**

Over its 20 year history, Georgia's Pre-K Program has not included developmental screening in its required activities. In 2014, Georgia began planning for the inclusion of developmental screening across the program to assist in accurately identifying children who may need more supports prior to kindergarten entry. During Year

One of the RTT-ELC grant, DECAL engaged Ellen Perrin, the author of the Survey of the Well-being of Young Children (SWYC), Katherine Beckman from ACF, and Camille Smith at the CDC in discussions about large scale screening efforts and the use of the SWYC in the Georgia's Pre-K Program developmental screening pilot. DECAL also coordinated with partners in other states to discuss progress being made on web-based versions of the instrument. Additionally, the state discussed with the SWYC author the current feasibility study on the SWYC and the role Georgia might play in this work.

## Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application)

*Has the State made progress in:*

Family Engagement	
Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of your Program Standards	Yes
Including information on activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development	Yes
Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported to implement the family engagement strategies	Yes
Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources	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.*

Georgia made progress on engaging and supporting families during Year One with the following RTT-ELC activities:

### **Review & Strengthen the Quality Rated Family Engagement Program Standards**

In Year One of the state's RTT-ELC, DECAL convened a task force to review and make recommendations on the ways to strengthen the Quality Rated standards on family engagement. DECAL leveraged an existing partnership with the BUILD initiative to facilitate and provide strategic guidance on the task force's work. Composed of individuals representing higher education, K-12 education, libraries, museums, community organizations, families, and state agencies, the Family Engagement Task Force met five times in 2014. The task force succeeded in generating a state definition of Family Engagement, identifying statewide family engagement strategies and promising practices, and developing draft recommendations for a revised Quality Rated family engagement standard.

The last Family Engagement Task Force meeting is scheduled in January 2015 to finalize their recommendations for revisions to the Quality Rated Family Engagement standards; however, DECAL is exploring ways to continue the task force's engagement, including maintaining an executive advisory committee, annual meetings, and enhanced communication strategies. Once the recommendations are finalized, they will be considered by the DECAL Quality Rated Policy Committee, an internal group that sets policy and guidelines for the program. Revisions to the Quality Rated standards will be implemented in the summer of 2015.

### **Grow Public Awareness on Child Development**

With the feedback from the Family Engagement Task Force, the state will develop tool kits for families with resources and activities related to early learning and development standards as well as to provide grants to support family engagement through the Georgia Family Connection Partnerships. DECAL used Year One of the RTT-ELC grant to begin planning for the dissemination grants to support family engagement. Though the state's scope of work does not call for these grants to be distributed until grant Years Three and Four, DECAL began implementation and awareness activities in Year One.

## **Home Visiting Initiatives**

Georgia began the process to implement the Great Start Georgia (GSG) framework and evidence-based home visiting in the Early Education Empowerment Zones. The Department of Human Services is the lead agency on this activity for the RTT-ELC grant. Several meetings were held with the Great Start Georgia Management Team and DECAL to begin planning the implementation process, and GSG team members attended the community and stakeholder meetings in the Early Education Empowerment Zones.

In Year One, the state hosted a day-long meeting with GSG Training and Technical Assistance Team to review the Great Start Georgia processes and protocols, identify the modifications needed to include early education programs as a “hub” for GSG in the community, and identify potential barriers and additional supports needed to ensure successful implementation. Meetings were held with the GSG Evaluation Team and DECAL staff to review MIECHV benchmarks related to school readiness to select the most appropriate outcomes for the RTT-ELC grant.

The state hosted a webinar on December 18, 2014 to introduce GSG and evidence-based home visiting to the Birth to Eight Teams and organizations in the E<sup>3</sup>Zs that will implement the project. Georgia also identified child care learning centers interested in implementing GSG/evidence-based home visiting and developed community plan proposal and budget outlines for the four E<sup>3</sup>Zs.

Going forward, DECAL and GSG will facilitate key stakeholder meetings within each E<sup>3</sup>Z to assist the community to develop the community plan/proposal and select the evidence-based home visiting model to implement. In early 2015, the state will finalize and execute contracts for the four E<sup>3</sup>Z home visiting expansion sites. Implementation of the GSG framework and evidence-based home visiting in the zones is expected to begin in July 2015.

## **Outreach to Family, Friend, and Neighbor Caregivers**

Family, friend and neighbor (FFN) caregivers are often isolated and have little opportunity for high-quality professional development. In Georgia's RTT-ELC application, the state planned to connect FFN caregivers with their local Head Start grantee to provide not only professional development, but also exposure to quality early learning and development practices and resources. Early in 2014, DECAL mapped the location of the FFN caregivers with Head Start grantee catchment areas. The mapping indicated that 24 of the 31 Head Start grantees had FFN caregivers residing in their regions. DECAL distributed the mini-grant applications to the 24 eligible grantees and conducted a webinar to explain the project and application process. However, out of the 24 eligible grantees, DECAL only received four applications, all of whom were ultimately awarded.

As a result of the low number of applications, DECAL is exploring new and more innovative ways to meet the goal of supporting FFN caregivers. In Year Two, DECAL will expand the scope of eligible grantees to include non-profit and education agencies to design and deliver innovative support services to FFN caregivers and families in high needs communities. This revised process will be implemented in Year Two.

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

---

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

---

*Has the State made progress in developing:*

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

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

Overall, the state has made considerable progress in updating the workforce knowledge and competency framework to better align professional development opportunities and thereby ensure an early education progression of credentials. Successes include a continued engagement with several different partners including postsecondary institutions, Administration of Children and Families, and Georgia's Professional Standards Commission. Subsequent work will include further engagement, a refinement of the Scope of Work to revise the workforce competencies, and the development of a revision team.

In Georgia, the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) oversees the verification of credentials for the state's Birth-12 teachers. This includes the verification of credentials for Georgia's Pre-K teachers and all teachers working in programs that are enrolled in Quality Rated. Therefore, they are a crucial partner in the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework revisions. In 2014, PSC conducted a task force that reviewed the standards for Birth-Five teacher preparation programs and the standards for a Birth-5 endorsement. As part of the Early Learning Challenge work, PSC also scaled up their capacity for meeting the needs of Quality Rated by hiring new assessors. As more programs enroll in Quality Rated, there is an increased need for credential assessors to review Birth through Five teachers.

Additionally, the state entered into a targeted technical assistance agreement with the Professional Development and Workforce (PDW) Initiatives team from the Administration of Children and Families (ACF-Region IV). As part of this work, the state has received the PDW analysis of the alignment of the workforce competencies with the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and Division of Early Childhood (DEC) standards. This work will inform the work of the revision team that will start meeting in Year Two.

A Workforce Knowledge and Competency advisory team was identified and met in August 2014. This team will work on identifying areas where articulation agreements can be strengthened, improving alignment between Georgia's Technical College System and Georgia's University system, and will review the recommendations made by the WKC revision team.



Finally, a team completed a draft of competencies for home visitors that will become part of Georgia's Professional Development System. This draft is currently under review by stakeholders. The final draft will be completed by the end of 2015.

There were a few unanticipated challenges to the work in Year One. First, the project lead retired at the end of September. The Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL) is currently working to fill the position, and examining ways to better align it with other professional development work in the grant and across the agency. Second, the PDW review referenced above identified that more revisions to Georgia's Workforce Knowledge Competency Framework may be needed than was originally anticipated. Furthermore, the Technical Assistance team that conducted the revision is no longer in operation, so in-depth assistance from this group is not possible. DECAL is identifying additional opportunities for TA.

Despite the challenges, the state is on-track to meet all deliverables for this project. Specifically, the revision team will be meeting in Year Two and further work with the Technical College System of Georgia is scheduled. The alignment of this work with the state's other projects is critical to ensure sustainability of the overall ELC progress made this year and the progress that will be made. Therefore, the state is being careful and deliberate with all revisions and is ensuring that all stakeholders are regularly engaged.

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
<i>Scholarships</i>	Yes
<i>Compensation and wage supplements</i>	Yes
<i>Tiered reimbursement rates</i>	
<i>Other financial incentives</i>	Yes
<i>Management opportunities</i>	
Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention	Yes
Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for:	Yes
<i>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</i>	Yes
<i>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</i>	Yes

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

The state made considerable progress in 2014 improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the early education workforce in Georgia. As described in the previous section, the state has identified revision needs in the state's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and will begin that revision process. For several years, the state has had articulation agreements in place between Georgia's Technical College and University Systems. Part of the work of the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework is revisiting the articulation agreements. This work will help improve Georgia's early education workforce.

The primary mechanism for improving Georgia's workforce in the first year of the grant has been the expansion of the state's INCENTIVES and SCHOLARSHIPS program. The INCENTIVES program rewards educators with two cash payments for increasing their educational level while the SCHOLARSHIPS program supports teachers by paying tuition, fees, and awarding stipends to offset the cost of higher education. The SCHOLARSHIPS program is aligned closely with the Georgia's popular lottery-funded HOPE scholarships and grants (for those educators who qualify) so that the combination of these programs supports early education teachers. Specifically, INCENTIVES and SCHOLARSHIPS was expanded to create AWARDS for Early Educators, comprised of the FIRST and SECOND programs, aimed at professionals achieving their first and second credentials. With RTT-ELC

funding, when an early learning development professional completes their program of study, they earn a cash bonus from AWARDS.

The expansion of SCHOLARSHIPS and INCENTIVES to target professionals earning their first or second credential significantly increased participation in the program. Participation in the SCHOLARSHIPS program increased 12% with a 24% increase in payments. Similarly, participation in INCENTIVES increased 21% with a 29% increase in payments. Overall, \$746,300 in payments were awarded to 524 educators who earned higher ECE credentials/degrees as a result of the FIRST and SECOND enhancements. The majority (n=270, 51%) earned a Child Development Credential (CDA) with a quarter (n=130) of beneficiaries earning either a Technical Certificate of Credit (TCC) or Technical College Diploma (TCD). It is encouraging that the remaining twenty four percent earned an Associate (n=53, 10%), Bachelor (n=55, 11%), or a Masters (n=16, 3%) as a result of the FIRST and SECOND enhancements. The state conducted an aggressive recruitment campaign that included educational counseling, conference presentations, college fairs, and emails to all licensed providers in the state. The existing SCHOLARSHIPS and INCENTIVES database was enhanced to ensure rapid application processing and data reporting.

Overall in Georgia, the Council for Professional Recognition awarded 1,118 new Child Development Associate (CDA) credentials in Georgia in fiscal year 2014 (10/1/2013 - 9/30/2014). The Technical College System of Georgia awarded 1,771 technical certificates of credit, 492 technical college diplomas, and 388 associate degrees in academic year 2014, as reported in GA AWARDS, Georgia's statewide longitudinal data system.

Georgia also began the process of expanding professional development communities. These communities correspond to TIERS 3 and 4 in the Professional Development hierarchy implemented as Project 5 in the grant. These communities align with the Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Z) and utilize information gained from the Georgia's Early Learning Initiative embedded in the state's K-12 Race to the Top Grant. (Results from that project can be found at [www.decal.ga.gov/BftS/EvaluationGAPreKProfDev](http://www.decal.ga.gov/BftS/EvaluationGAPreKProfDev)). A professional learning community specialist was hired in August with implementation of the communities scheduled for implementation in Year Two.

There were two challenges encountered in 2014. First, there were more entry level credentials (CDA, TCC, TCD) awarded than anticipated and fewer higher level credentials. While this does not pose a challenge in the administration of the program, it does indicate that further outreach may be needed to encourage teachers to earn an Associates, Bachelors, or Masters. Second, the Professional Learning Community Specialist was hired later than anticipated. This does not delay the initial implementation of the communities but did delay the planning.

In Year Two, the state will continue to recruit educators to INCENTIVES and SCHOLARSHIPS via the FIRST and SECOND enhancements with a specific focus on the higher level credentials. Second, the state will begin the implementation of the professional learning communities and will develop a coaching credential program. Finally, the state is ramping up evaluation efforts to ensure success of each activity. This will ensure that not only are the targets met, but that the state's early education workforce has truly been strengthened through these efforts.

## 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.**

	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	31	31	31	31	31	43			
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	4,333	4,500	4,950	5,445	5,990	5,546			

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

The Technical College System of Georgia awarded 2,651 technical certificates of credit, technical college diplomas, and associate degrees and the University System of Georgia awarded 1,777 bachelor's, master's, specialist, and doctoral degrees related to early childhood education during the 2014 academic year, as reported by Georgia's statewide longitudinal data system (GA AWARDS). The Council for Professional Recognition reports 1,118 Child Development Associate (CDA) credentials awarded in fiscal year 2014 (10/1/2013 - 9/30/2014).

The number of aligned institutions was under-reported in the baseline data; there are 24 technical colleges within the Technical College System of Georgia and 18 colleges and universities within the University System of Georgia that offer credential or degree programs aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. In addition, the Council for Professional Recognition offers the Child Development Associate, a national credential that is aligned to Georgia's framework.

The number of technical college institutions will be reduced from 24 to 23 in academic year 2015 and to 22 in academic year 2016 due to mergers among institutions. In 2015, Georgia will also explore alignment with private and independent colleges offering degree programs in early childhood in Georgia.

### **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.*

The state exceeded targets in these areas. As stated in the data notes, Georgia actually under-reported the number of aligned institutions in 2013.

## 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									
Credentials Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Non-credentialed	14,932	38.00%	14,429	36.00%	13,491	33.00%	12,093	29.00%	10,633	25.00%
Child Development Associate (CDA)	5,894	15.00%	6,814	17.00%	6,950	17.00%	7,923	19.00%	8,507	20.00%
Technical College Early Childhood Care and Education Certificate of Credit	3,929	10.00%	4,008	10.00%	4,497	11.00%	5,004	12.00%	5,529	23.00%
Technical College Early Childhood Care and Education Diploma	2,358	6.00%	2,405	6.00%	2,862	7.00%	2,919	7.00%	3,403	8.00%
Early Care and Education Associate Degree (AA, AAS)	4,715	12.00%	4,810	12.00%	5,315	13.00%	5,421	13.00%	5,955	14.00%
Bachelors Degrees (including BS in Education, Major in Birth-Five)	5,108	13.00%	5,210	13.00%	5,315	13.00%	5,838	14.00%	5,955	14.00%
Masters, Specialist and Doctoral Degrees (M.S., M.Ed., M.A.T., Ph.D.)	2,358	6.00%	2,405	6.00%	2,453	6.00%	2,502	6.00%	2,552	6.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>39,294</b>		<b>40,080</b>		<b>40,881</b>		<b>41,699</b>		<b>42,533</b>	

Actuals										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>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</i>									
Credentials Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Non-credentialed	14,932	38.00%								
Child Development Associate (CDA)	5,894	15.00%								
Technical College Early Childhood Care and Education Certificate of Credit	3,929	10.00%								
Technical College Early Childhood Care and Education Diploma	2,358	6.00%								
Early Care and Education Associate Degree (AA, AAS)	4,715	12.00%								
Bachelors Degrees (including BS in Education, Major in Birth-Five)	5,108	13.00%								
Masters, Specialist and Doctoral Degrees (M.S., M.Ed., M.A.T., Ph.D.)	2,358	6.00%								
Non-credentialed	14,932	38.00%								
Total	39,294									

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

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

For the baseline, Georgia's total workforce was estimated using child care licensing, Pre-K, Head Start, and special needs program data (including directors, lead teachers, assistant teachers, family child care providers and assistants, group child care providers and assistants, inclusion teachers, early intervention specialists, early childhood special educators, family service workers, and home visitors). Baseline credential data were estimated using Professional Development Registry (PDR) data, workforce findings from the studies of child care quality in Georgia conducted by the FPG Child Development Institute (Maxwell, et al., 2009a; 2009c; 2010a; Appendices 3, 4, and 5), and workforce findings from the study of the economic impact of the Georgia child care industry (Child Policy Partnership, 2008). The total workforce was estimated at 39,294, and 62% of the workforce were estimated to hold one of the above credentials. For targets, a 2% growth in total workforce has been estimated per year, for a 2017 workforce of 42,553, of whom 75% will hold one of the above credentials. (The workforce will grow, for example, when the family child care definition is revised to include those caring for two or more unrelated children for pay.) Full workforce credential data will become available by 2017 when all ELD programs are participating in the TQRIS, which requires educators to register in the PDR.

Since the baseline was estimated by relying in part on prior studies that measured characteristics of the workforce through representative samples of early learning programs, and in the absence of a new study that might identify a change in credential levels, Complete workforce data size and credentials by level are not

available for Year One. Georgia has commissioned a study of the economic impact of the child care industry in the state that will provide an estimate of the size and credential levels of the early childhood workforce. Results will be available in the summer of 2015.

While the total workforce at each credential level cannot be ascertained, other data points indicate that new credentials are being awarded. For example, the Council for Professional Recognition awarded 1,118 new Child Development Associate (CDA) credentials (Credential Type 1) in Georgia in fiscal year 2014 (10/1/2013 - 9/30/2014). The Technical College System of Georgia awarded 1,771 technical certificates of credit (Credential Type 2), 492 technical college diplomas (Credential Type 3), and 388 associate degrees (Credential Type 4) in academic year 2014, as reported in GA AWARDS, Georgia's statewide longitudinal data system.

Furthermore, while it is not representative of the full workforce, Georgia's Professional Development Registry (PDR), a Georgia Professional Standards Commission credentialing system, reports the following degrees/credentials for ELD program directors, lead teachers, and assistant teachers as of 1/26/2015: 2,648 CDAs, 1,489 technical college certificates, 1,208 technical college diplomas, 6,461 associate's degrees, 6,913 bachelor's degrees, 3,202 master's degrees or higher, and 18,304 non-credentialed. The PDR captures active registrants of staff in programs participating in TQRIS, educators in Pre-K classrooms, educators in the tuition assistance program, the salary bonus/educational award program, and all other early childhood educators in the state who voluntarily elect to track their professional development through this system. It does not capture current employment status in the early childhood field of registrants, and because registration at this time is required for some programs where higher credentials are expected (e.g., Pre-K, Quality Rated) but voluntary for others (e.g., licensed programs), PDR numbers are not representative of the total ELD workforce. Because PDR participation is required for Quality Rated programs, the registry will provide more representative workforce data by the end of 2017 when all early learning programs are covered by Quality Rated.

#### **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.*

As noted above, the state has only incomplete data regarding progression on these targets at this time. However, through the ELC-funded AWARDS for Early Educators program, \$746,300 was awarded to 524 early educators who earned higher ECE credential/degrees, including: 270 Child Development Associates, 99 technical certificates of credit, 31 technical college diplomas, 53 associate degrees, 55 bachelor's degrees, and 16 master's degrees. This data, combined with the data from the PDR as outlined above, indicates that the state is on track has reason to be confident in its ability to meet the targets identified in our application.

## 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 state is using the Georgia's Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS) in developing the Kindergarten Entry Profile (KEP). The GELDS includes the following domains: 1) Physical Development and Motor Skills; 2) Social and Emotional Development; 3) Approaches to Play and Learning; 4) Communication, Language, and Literacy; and 5) Cognitive Development and General Knowledge. All domains of the GELDS are being considered in the KEP.

In early 2015, the state is convening work groups to identify the specific GELDS domains and associated tasks for the KEP. There is a statewide pilot planned in Spring 2015 (Pre-K classrooms) and Fall 2015 (Kindergarten classrooms) that will address reliability and validity. The timing of the administration of the KEP is planned for the first six weeks of school.

*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 2014, Georgia made significant strides in adding a Kindergarten Entry Profile (KEP) as a component of the Georgia Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (GKIDS). GKIDS is a year-long performance-based assessment aligned to the state's learning standards and is used as a formative assessment in all public kindergarten classrooms across the state. The KEP will provide formative assessment information during the first six weeks of kindergarten in order to equip educators, parents, and the state with high-quality information



about individual student readiness so that appropriate supports and interventions can be established as needed to ensure that all students, regardless of where they began, leave kindergarten ready to learn at higher levels and thrive.

The Department of Education (DOE) is the RTT-ELC Participating State Agency and is the project lead for the development of the KEP. In August, DOE hired a Kindergarten Entry Assessment Specialist to manage this project, and in October of 2014, DOE developed and released a Request for Proposals (RFP) to secure a vendor to perform the test development services. In early December 2014, NCS Pearson was selected as the contractor to perform the test development services.

Before the end of the first grant year, DOE staff conducted the initial planning meeting with NCS Pearson to review the overall project plan and timelines. DOE reviewed the plans for the developing and piloting tasks and protocols. The vendor also conducted a literature review. This literature review will inform the work of the KEP Development Committee in identifying the essential concepts and skills to be assessed, selecting the assessment methods to be used, and ensuring the developmental appropriateness of the KEP protocols and tasks. DOE has assembled teacher committees to provide input into the initial development.

During Year Two of the RTT-ELC grant, the teacher committees will continue to play a pivotal role in providing input and delivering feedback on the development of the KEA. Teacher involvement, guidance, and input will ensure that the instrument is accurate as well as promote buy-in and understanding within and across the educator community. The teacher committees will identify essential skills and concepts to be assessed on the KEA, review proposed tasks, and plan for online training modules. In the spring of 2015, DOE and DECAL will partner to pilot the KEA in Georgia's Pre-K classrooms and the assessment will be field tested in kindergarten classrooms in the fall of 2015.

## Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)

*Has the State made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that:*

Early Learning Data Systems	
Has all of the Essential Data Elements	Yes
Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs	Yes
Facilitates the exchange of data among Participating State Agencies by using standard data structures, data formats, and data definitions such as Common Education Data Standards to ensure interoperability among the various levels and types of data	Yes
Generates information that is timely, relevant, accessible, and easy for Early Learning and Development Programs and Early Childhood Educators to use for continuous improvement and decision making	Yes
Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws	Yes

*Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including the State's progress in building or enhancing a separate early learning data system that aligns with and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that meets the criteria described above. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.*

Prior to winning an Early Learning Challenge grant, DECAL had already begun construction of an early learning and development data system called the Cross Agency Child Data System (CACDS). In Year One of the RTT-ELC, Georgia made significant progress in enhancing CACDS by deepening partnerships with the Department of Public Health (DPH), Department of Human Services (DHS), the Department of Education (DOE), the Governor's Office of Student Achievement (GOSA) and Head Start and Early Head Start grantees by establishing strong data governance, defining data elements, and developing meaningful research questions.

### **Strong Data Governance**

In Year One DECAL further delineated the governance structure of CACDS to include a defined hierarchy, identify specific persons from each agency, and establish a Charter. The governance structure for CACDS includes the Georgia Children's Cabinet to set the vision, a Data Management Committee that is comprised of the Chief Information Officers and technical leadership from each participating agency to support data sharing, and the DECAL Research Team whose members have worked to build the policy and list the questions that will be refined in 2015 with the participating agencies.

Georgia also developed a plan to execute a data sharing agreement among the participating state agencies in two phases. In Year One and the first half of Year Two, the general agreement that each participating agency signed to participate in the RTT-ELC will be used to pilot the data sharing into CACDS. Once the pilot is complete and all parties are better informed on what data is collected and how it will be shared, a more specific Data Sharing Agreement will be created and subjected to a full legal review across all agencies. Year Two will focus on policy and question vetting with the partner agencies and the development of a robust long term data

sharing agreement to be signed by the leadership of DECAL, DPH, DHS, DOE, GOSA and the Head Start and Early Head Start grantees.

### **Defined Data Elements**

In collaboration with the DECAL Research Team, the characteristics to support the identification of young “Children with High Needs” were isolated. Two primary characteristics identified are: 1) low income- children who meet the federal income eligibility requirements for Early Head Start, Head Start, or the Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) subsidized child care program, and 2) disabilities- children who meet the federal eligibility requirements for IDEA Part C (Babies Can't Wait), IDEA Part B (619), and children attending kindergarten with Individual Education Plans (IEP) due to delayed learning.

DECAL already has the data elements as defined for children living in families with low income and spent the second part of Year One working with the participating agencies to pinpoint the appropriate data elements that identify disabilities. At this time there are clearly defined data elements for:

IDEA Part C - Department of Public Health (Babies Can't Wait) from the Babies Information and Billing System (BIBS)

IDEA Part B - Department of Education from their Full Time Equivalent Fall data

Vital Records - Department of Public Health from their Children 1st system for birth weight and birth order

Year Two will focus on mapping the data elements from these source systems into CACDS and performing a pilot that will include data transfer; extract, transfer and load process, and data review. In addition, an interim process will be tested; this process will leverage another partner agency for person matching.

### **Meaningful Research Questions**

Initially, Georgia planned to use the research questions developed in 2010 to guide the expansion of CACDS using RTT-ELC funding. This includes adding data elements from the Department of Public Health, Department of Human Services, the Department of Education and Head Start and Early Head Start. However, the team soon realized that key leaders in the partnering state agencies had changed since the 2010 Data Roundtable and the agencies' policy priorities and objectives had changed as well. Furthermore, though DECAL was and is both the physical and administrative home of CACDS, internal stakeholder knowledge had waned since 2010.

The Georgia team decided to begin with DECAL and hosted a learning session in October 2014 on CACDS for the combined Senior Leadership and Senior Management Teams of the agency. These 40 individuals represent the key personnel across all of the agency's programs (including administrative functions such as finance and audits). The meeting was designed to not only share information about CACDS so that internal stakeholders could have focused answers to questions such as data governance and birth-five policies, but also to engage the members of the leadership team in the design of research and policy questions for CACDS to build excitement around the work. The state plans to host similar meetings with all of the participating state agencies in early 2015.

The promise of CACDS for positively influencing policies and programs for children in Georgia is great. The internal stakeholder informational and question drafting sessions have and will provide an opportunity to not only help develop the policy and research questions critical to the successful build-out of CACDS, but also to ensure that the “buy-in” exists to keep the work moving beyond the RTT-ELC grant period.

## 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 <sup>1</sup> 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	72,125	54.8%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	145,946	54.8%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	225,410	54.8%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	443,482	54.8%

<sup>1</sup> 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.

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that 54.81% of children ages 0-5 in Georgia are in families with income less than 200% of the poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates).

According to the U.S. Census 2013 Population Estimates, the total number of children 0-5 in Georgia is 809,077, including 131,584 under age 1, 266,260 ages 1 and 2, and 411,233 ages 3-5 (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2014). Since low-income data are not available by single years of age, the number reported for each age group above is the total population multiplied by 54.81%.

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 <sup>1</sup>	17,666	2.2%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	124,056	15.3%
Reside on "Indian Lands"		
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	3,748	0.5%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	33,613	4.2%
Are in foster care	6,717	0.8%
<sup>1</sup> 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). <sup>2</sup> 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. <sup>3</sup> 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). <sup>4</sup> 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.

All percentages are based on a Georgia 0-5 population of 809,077, following the U.S. Census 2013 Population Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2014).

Disabilities or Developmental Delays: 8,185 children ages 0-2 had an IFSP in federal fiscal year 2014 under IDEA Part C based on December 1, 2013, federal data count. 9,481 children ages 3-5 had an IEP at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year under IDEA Part B, section 619; Georgia Department of Education, October 2014 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2015-1). Of the students served in IDEA Part B, section 619, Georgia's Pre-K reports 2,780 children with an IEP (3.45% of all Pre-K students); 2014-2015 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data. Early Head Start and Head Start report 2,826 children with an IEP or IFSP (9.83% of all Early Head Start and Head Start students); 2012-2013 Program Information Report.

English learners: 15.33% of the population 5 to 17 years of age in Georgia speaks a language other than English at home according to the U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates. This percentage has been applied to the 0-5 population, for whom these data are not reported. 10.02% of Georgia's Pre-K students are identified by providers as having "limited language proficiency," defined as "difficulty speaking the English language" (2014-2015 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data). 11.26% of Early Head Start and Head Start students have a primary language other than English (2013-2014 Program Information Report).

Migrant: 0.463% of Kindergarten to Grade 3 students in Georgia in 2013-2014 were eligible for the Migrant Education Program (Georgia Department of Education, School Year 2013-14 Student Record Data Collection System [SR 2014]). This same percentage has been applied here to the 0-5 population, for whom eligibility is less comprehensively determined. Local educational agencies report serving 308 migrant pre-kindergartners and 528 migrant kindergartners in 2013-2014 (Georgia Department of Education, School Year 2013-14 Student Record

Data Collection System [SR 2014]), while Migrant and Seasonal Head Start reports a funded enrollment of 161 children in 2013-2014.

Homeless: The National Center on Family Homelessness (NCFH) uses the number of students identified as homeless by local educational agencies (LEAs), as required by the McKinney-Vento Act, to estimate the number of homeless children ages 0-5, based on research estimating that 51% of all homeless children are under age 6 (*America's Youngest Outcasts: A Report Card on Child Homelessness*. [2014]. Waltham, MA: The National Center on Family Homelessness at American Institutes for Research. Pp. 99-101). In 2012-2013, LEAs in Georgia identified 32,295 homeless students in grades 1 through 12 (Consolidated State Performance Report). The 0-5 number estimated here follows the NCFH method and assumes the count for grades 1 through 12 represents 49% of all children. LEAs report serving 611 homeless pre-kindergartners and 3,021 homeless kindergartners in 2013-2014 (Georgia Department of Education, School Year 2013-14 Student Record Data Collection System [SR 2014]), while Early Head Start and Head Start report serving 532 homeless children (Program Information Report, 2013-2014).

Foster care: Children 0-5 in foster care during state fiscal year 2014, with age calculated as of the child's first day in custody during the calendar year (Georgia SHINES data system, 2014).

**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.*

<b>Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning &amp; Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	-	-	46,227	46,227
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program (4 year olds only)			
Data Source and Year:	Program data, 2014-2015 roster 2 (December 2014)			
<b>Early Head Start &amp; Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	779	2,657	24,018	27,454
Data Source and Year:	Head Start Program Information Report, 2014			
<b>Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	960	7,225	9,481	17,666
Data Source and Year:	Part C: Federal data counts, December 1, 2013; Part B: October 2014 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	-	-	-	-
Data Source and Year:	(blank)			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	3,441	15,767	21,979	41,187
Data Source and Year:	Maximus CCDF data system, 2014			
<b>Other 1</b>	268	381	37	686
Specify:	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Grant (MIECHV)			
Data Source and Year:	Georgia Home Visiting Information System (GEOHVIS), 2014			
<sup>1</sup> 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.*

Pre-K: Georgia's Pre-K is a universal program, not targeted to special populations, and does not collect child income data nor home language data. The total number of children with high needs in Georgia's Pre-K is an estimate based on counting all enrolled children who were marked as having an IEP, having limited English proficiency, or participating in a means-tested benefit, as reported by grantee programs to the state in roster 2 data for the 2014-2015 school year. This count, while actual, is only approximate to the definition of children with high needs. By this method it is estimated that 57.4% of all Georgia's Pre-K students are children with high needs. PeachCare, Georgia's Child Health Insurance Program, was removed from the means-tested benefit data collected by Georgia's Pre-K beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. As a result, the highest possible benefit eligibility that was counted for Georgia's Pre-K students dropped from 235% of the federal poverty level to 185% for students in school systems (free and reduced lunch) and 149% for students in private programs (Medicaid). This explains why the number of children with high needs served in Georgia's Pre-K appears to have dropped from the baseline.

Early Head Start and Head Start cumulative enrollment reported; Early Head Start and Head Start funded enrollment is not available by age. Program Information Report, 2013-2014 school year.

IDEA, Part C: December 1, 2013, federal data count.

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia Department of Education, October 2014 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2015-1).

Title I of ESEA: Title I preschool classes in Georgia have been converted into Georgia's Pre-K classes; school districts use Title I funds to supplement their Georgia's Pre-K classes.

CCDF: Average monthly children served in calendar year 2014 by age. CCDF also served 20,091 children over the age of 5 on average.

MIECHV: Children active during calendar year 2014. More recent data reveals that a more accurate baseline count would be 681 children active during calendar year 2013, including 393 under age one, 271 ages 1 through 2, and 17 ages three through five.



**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	9,990	82	1,270	21,116	56	1,500	12,213
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program						
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	3,638	39	160	19,250	51	1,074	5,495
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	572	13	288	3,175	13	244	3,880
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,356	20	285	3,259	9	316	4,236
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	2,477	184	111	48,404	73	1,830	8,041
Other 1	145	1	36	372		14	87
Describe:	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Grant (MIECHV)						

<sup>1</sup> 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.*

Pre-K: 2014-2015 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2014. Totals here are for the 46,227 students identified as children with high needs. For all 80,551 students served, race and ethnicity is as follows: Hispanic: 12,745; non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native: 149; non-Hispanic Asian: 2,830; non-Hispanic Black or African American: 31,898; non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander: 118; non-Hispanic two or more races: 2,835; non-Hispanic White: 29,976.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Cumulative enrollment, Program Information Report, 2013-2014 school year. Early Head Start and Head Start race and ethnicity data are reported separately in the Program Information Report and are not able to be aggregated into the federal reporting categories. Therefore the Hispanic count is double-reported in the race categories as well. These counts include 237 pregnant women because the Program Information Report does not allow race and ethnicity to be disaggregated by age. In addition, the Program Information Report has counts of 819 "Other Race" and 803 "Unspecified Race."

IDEA, Part C: December 1, 2013, federal data count

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia Department of Education, October 2014 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2015-1)

Title I of ESEA: Title I preschool classes in Georgia have been converted into Georgia's Pre-K classes; school districts use Title I funds to supplement their Georgia's Pre-K classes.

CCDF: Average monthly children served in calendar year 2014 by race and ethnicity (Maximus data system, January 2015). Total includes 20,091 children on average over the age of 5. Total does not include 158 children on average whose families declined to report race and ethnicity.

MIECHV: Children active during calendar year 2014; race/ethnicity unrecorded for 31 children. More recent data reveals that a more accurate baseline count would be 681 children active during calendar year 2013, with race/ethnicity as follows: Hispanic: 151; non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native: 1; non-Hispanic Asian: 36; non-Hispanic Black or African American: 356; non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander: 1; non-Hispanic two or more races: 14; non-Hispanic White: 94; unrecorded: 28.

**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.*

<b>Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year</b>					
<b>Type of investment</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>
<b>Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start &amp; Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$299,232,510	\$311,573,630			
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program				
<b>State contributions to IDEA, Part C</b>	\$9,127,631	\$9,127,631			
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry</b>	\$28,412,355	\$28,412,355			
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$52,469,461	\$54,234,300			
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Met			
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>					
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>	\$1,326,179	\$1,217,552			
Specify:	State funds for Child Care Services (licensing and administration)				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	\$3,099,816	\$3,099,816			
Specify:	HOPE Grants and HOPE Scholarships to students pursuing ECE certificate, diploma or degree				
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>	\$4,718,332	\$4,718,332			
Specify:	Children 1st screening referral and follow-up system				
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>	\$40,000				
Specify:	Title 1, ESEA				
<b>Other State contributions 5</b>	\$200,000	\$600,000			
Specify:	Family Connection Partnership				
<b>Other State contributions 6</b>	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000			
Specify:	Philanthropic contributions (United Way of Greater Atlanta: Quality Rated, Substitute Teacher Program, Get Ready to Read Program, Early Learning Property Management Program, Partners Advancing Childhood Education)				
<b>Other State contributions 7</b>	\$155,000	\$180,000			
Specify:	Philanthropic contributions (Georgia Early Education Alliance for Ready Students [GEEARS]: summer reading activities, Quality Rated public awareness)				
<b>Other State contributions 8</b>	\$1,914,438	\$2,000,000			
Specify:	Philanthropic contributions (Atlanta Speech School, Rollins Center for Language and Literacy: professional development services to teachers in language and literacy for children birth to Pre-K)				
<b>Total State contributions:</b>	<b>\$398,626,464</b>	<b>\$421,163,616</b>			

<sup>1</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

<sup>2</sup> Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.

<sup>3</sup> 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.*

All data are for the state fiscal year, which begins July 1 and ends June 30.

In addition to the philanthropic funds included in the table, Georgia Family Connection Partnership reports \$3,495,678 in awards received in calendar year 2014 to support Quality Rated. These awards include: \$1,000,000 from the Goizueta Foundation, \$100,000 from the Naserian Foundation, \$145,678 from the Pittulloch Foundation, \$2,000,000 from the Whitehead Foundation/United Way of Greater Atlanta, and \$250,000 from the Zeist Foundation.

State contributions to IDEA Part C, State contributions to special education for ages 3-5, Other State contributions 2, and Other State contributions 3 reflect carryovers from the 2014 baseline. Validated amounts for those sections could not be obtained at this time, but state investment in those sections either met or exceeded the baseline amounts in 2014. Other State Contributions 4 refers to a conference that was held in FY2013 but discontinued in FY2014.

**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.*

<b>Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b> <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	50,496	46,227	-
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program		
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	25,396	23,682	-
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	16,493	17,666	-
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b> <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report )</i>	-	-	-
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> <i>(average monthly served)</i>	60,858	61,278	-
<b>Other 1</b>	1,116	686	-
Describe:	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Grant (MIECHV)		
<b>Other 2</b>	7,519	8,185	-
Describe:	IDEA Part C		
<b>Other 3</b>	8,974	9,481	-
Describe:	IDEA Part B		
<sup>1</sup> Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.			
<sup>2</sup> 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.*

Pre-K: 2014-2015 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2014.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Program Information Report, 2013-2014 school year. Early Head Start and Head Start funded enrollment is reported here, as requested. However, Tables (A)(1)-3a and (A)(1)-3b report cumulative enrollment because funded enrollment cannot be reported by age or by race/ethnicity.

IDEA, Part C: December 1, 2013, federal data count

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia Department of Education, October 2014 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2015-1)

Title I of ESEA: Title I preschool classes in Georgia have been converted into Georgia's Pre-K classes; school districts use Title I funds to supplement their Georgia's Pre-K classes.

CCDF: Average monthly children served in calendar year 2014 by race and ethnicity (Maximus data system, January 2015). Total includes 20,091 children on average over the age of 5.

MIECHV: Children active during calendar year 2014. More recent data reveals that a more accurate baseline count would be 681 children active during calendar year 2013.

## 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 Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS) have been in use since 2013 and cover all domains of children's learning and development including Physical Development and Motor Skills, Social and Emotional Development, Approaches to Play and Learning, Communication, Language, and Literacy, Math, Science, Social Studies, Creative Development, and Cognitive Processes.

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:	Georgia's Pre-K Program				
Early Head Start & Head Start <sup>1</sup>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
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					
State licensing requirements			✓		✓
Other 1	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Describe:	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Grant (MIECHV)				

<sup>1</sup> 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.

Georgia's Pre-K uses Work Sampling Online as the formative assessment in all classes. Pre-K classrooms in TQRIS are sampled for ECERS-R observations. The CLASS assessment is used annually to measure child-adult interactions in a rotating sample of Georgia's Pre-K classrooms.

Head Start and Early Head Start employ health and developmental screening, use developmental child assessment tools, and meet Head Start and Early Head Start performance standards regarding the environment as well as use Environment Rating Scales (ITERS-R and ECERS-R). The CLASS is used for measuring adult/child interactions. Other child assessments include Galileo, Teaching Strategies Gold, High Scope, and Work Sampling System.



Screening in IDEA Part C occurs as part of eligibility process. Hearing and vision are screened prior to evaluation. Formative assessment is conducted on all eligible children and used to develop IFSP goals, activities, and strategies.

Many LEAs conduct screenings under IDEA Part B, section 619 but this is not an activity required by the state Department of Education. LEAs are required to conduct summative assessments to measure progress on the preschool outcomes as required in indicator B-7 of the USDOE/OSEP Annual Performance Report/State Performance Report (APR/SPP).

Over the past 5 years, Title I preschool classes in Georgia have been converted into Georgia's Pre-K classes; school districts use Title I funds to supplement their Georgia's Pre-K classes.

These elements are not currently required in CCDF.

Georgia's TQRIS tiers are assigned based on a point system. Screening measures and formative assessments are required for points at all tiers. All rated programs receive Environment Rating Scale observations (ITERS-R, ECERS-R, FCCERS-R); these instruments include a subscale related to interactions.

Licensing rules require an adequate amount of varied age-appropriate equipment and activities. Additionally, lesson plans that include specified developmental domains (variety and developmentally appropriate) are required.

MIECHV includes: comprehensive Core Screening to determine eligibility into program services and home visiting; developmental screenings at appropriate intervals (ASQ & ASQ-SE) on all children within the child care setting; assessments conducted for all evidence-based home visiting models (i.e., Life Skills Progression for families entering Parents as Teachers). In addition, a measure of environmental quality is conducted through the HOME Inventory. Data is collected on program structure, quality, performance measures and all benchmarks.

## Budget and Expenditure Tables

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

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

#### Budget Summary Table

Budget Summary Table					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$468,848.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$468,848.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$258,788.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$258,788.15
3. Travel	\$8,676.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,676.00
4. Equipment	\$67,555.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$67,555.00
5. Supplies	\$6,210.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,210.00
6. Contractual	\$624,353.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$624,353.00
7. Training Stipends	\$746,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$746,300.00
8. Other	\$4,371.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,371.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$2,185,101.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,185,101.15
10. Indirect Costs	\$87,477.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$87,477.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$166,167.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$166,167.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$23,263.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,263.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>\$2,462,008.15</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$2,462,008.15</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$6,866,778.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,866,778.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$9,328,786.15</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$9,328,786.15</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Budget Summary Table Narrative**

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

Georgia's actual expenditures include both spent and encumbered funds from Year One. During Year One, Georgia paid special attention to effective implementation planning and stakeholder engagement. While we believe this will ensure maximum sustainability of the system reforms of our RTT-ELC grant, it did create some delays in expending funds as initially planned. For example, the state utilized comprehensive community engagement to select the Early Education Empowerment Zones. While this process engaged hundreds of stakeholders in critical areas of the state, it delayed the launch of several key contracts and hiring decisions across several projects (projects two, three, and eight, in particular).

Georgia also had difficulty finding qualified personnel across RTT-ELC projects. Rather than hurriedly hire less than ideal candidates, the state took the time to diligently seek out those individuals who would be able to hit the ground running. This created a ripple down effect of unspent fringe benefit, equipment and travel funds as a result of hiring delays across nearly every project. However, the state has since filled all RTT-ELC positions scheduled to begin in Year One.

Additionally, Georgia had unspent contractual funds in some projects because the state was able to effectively maximize previously awarded external technical assistance from a variety of sources, particularly on projects nine and twelve, to provide support to projects that we had initially planned to use RTT-ELC funding for in Year One. While this left the state with unspent Year One funds, it will allow us to instead look at utilizing RTT-ELC funds to implement the revisions and suggestions provided to us by external technical assistance.

**Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes**

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

As detailed in the project budget narratives below, Georgia will submit amendment requests where needed to move all unexpended Year One funds to carry over into grant Year Two to support project activities planned for 2015. While the state under-spent in year one, Georgia is on track to catch up on spending in Year Two of the RTT-ELC grant.

## Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Management

Budget Table: Project 1					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$157,733.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$157,733.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$91,408.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$91,408.15
3. Travel	\$2,206.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,206.00
4. Equipment	\$3,928.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,928.00
5. Supplies	\$492.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$492.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$1,946.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,946.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$257,713.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$257,713.15
10. Indirect Costs	\$16,086.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,086.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$23,263.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,263.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$297,062.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$297,062.15
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$65,672.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$65,672.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$362,734.15</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$362,734.15</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 1 Budget Narrative**

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

There were no major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

**Project 1 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

There are no substantive changes anticipated to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Budget Table: Project 2 - Early Education Empowerment Zones

Budget Table: Project 2					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$57,132.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$57,132.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$30,927.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,927.00
3. Travel	\$1,838.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,838.00
4. Equipment	\$14,638.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,638.00
5. Supplies	\$1,490.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,490.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$364.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$364.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$106,389.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$106,389.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$13,442.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,442.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$119,831.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$119,831.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$119,831.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$119,831.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 2 Budget Narrative**

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

The major discrepancy between the State's budgeted and actual costs for Project 2 was in Personnel and Fringe Benefits. Because the selection process for the zones was elongated, the State delayed in hiring the Community Coordinator for each of the four zones until the zone selection process had been completed.

**Project 2 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

There are no substantive changes anticipated to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Quality Rated Access and Availability

Budget Table: Project 3					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$56,391.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$56,391.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$33,508.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$2,844.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,844.00
4. Equipment	\$20,026.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,026.00
5. Supplies	\$1,475.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,475.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$1,217.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,217.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$115,461.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$115,461.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$36,761.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,761.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$162,142.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$162,142.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$314,364.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$314,364.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$5,756,886.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,756,886.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$6,071,250.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$6,071,250.00</b>

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



**Project 3 Budget Narrative**

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

The major discrepancy between the State's budgeted and actual costs for Project 2 was in Personnel and Fringe Benefits, as well as Funds to be Distributed. The hiring process to find qualified and experienced candidates for RTT-ELC funded positions took longer than expected. For the roles of Quality Rated Assessors, due to the intensive training and on-boarding process, the State staggered the hiring of these positions. Additionally, due to the longer than expected selection process for the Early Education Empowerment Zones, the contracts for child care subsidy and reduced parent co-pay in those regions were not able to be launched in year one, leaving a surplus in that budget field.

**Project 3 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

DECAL will work with our program officers to submit the necessary amendments to carry over unspent funds in Year One into Year Two to successfully launch the contract and reduced parent co-pay projects.

## Budget Table: Project 4 – Quality Rated Validation

Budget Table: Project 4					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$27,407.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$27,407.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$15,543.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$90.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$90.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$92.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$92.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$43,132.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$43,132.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$3,490.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,490.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$46,622.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$46,622.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$46,622.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$46,622.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 4 Budget Narrative**

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

There were no major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

**Project 4 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

There are no substantive changes anticipated to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Budget Table: Project 5 - Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

Budget Table: Project 5					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$58,406.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$58,406.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$26,391.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$954.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$954.00
4. Equipment	\$3,824.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,824.00
5. Supplies	\$1,660.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,660.00
6. Contractual	\$371,855.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$371,855.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$600.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$463,690.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$463,690.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$6,565.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,565.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$470,255.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$470,255.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$470,255.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$470,255.00

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

**Project 5 Budget Narrative**

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

The major discrepancy between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year was in Contractual. This was due to a Request for Proposals process that was delayed and took longer than expected.

**Project 5 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent contractual funds forward across future years of the grant.

## Budget Table: Project 6 - Comprehensive Assessment System

Budget Table: Project 6					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$14,497.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,497.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$14,497.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,497.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$14,497.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,497.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$18,489.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$18,489.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$32,986.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$32,986.00</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

**Project 6 Budget Narrative**

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

There were no major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

**Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

There are no substantive changes anticipated to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

## Budget Table: Project 7 - Statewide Family Engagement and Community Grants

Budget Table: Project 7					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$21,656.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21,656.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$12,124.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$101.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$101.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$75.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$75.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$152.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$152.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$34,108.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$34,108.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$2,273.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,273.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$36,381.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,381.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$600,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$600,000.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$636,381.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$636,381.00</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.



**Project 7 Budget Narrative**

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

There were no major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year. Unspent travel funds were due to subcommittee work taking place primarily in Metro Atlanta. Unspent Other funds were due to a delay in the need for printed materials.

**Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

There are no substantive changes anticipated to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Center-based Home Visitation and FFN Care

Budget Table: Project 8					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$8,953.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,953.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$5,047.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$14,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,000.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$1,042.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,042.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$4,025.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,025.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$19,067.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,067.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$19,067.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,067.00

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

**Project 8 Budget Narrative**

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

Due to the delay in the selection of the Early Education Empowerment Zones, Funds to be Distributed to begin evidence based home visiting services were not able to be launched in Year One. Additionally, the Department of Human Services decided to contribute personnel time to this project from non-RTT-ELC funding sources in Year One.

**Project 8 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

Georgia will work with our Project Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to move unspent Year One funding in Personnel, Fringe, and Funds to be Distributed across the remaining years of the grant.

Budget Table: Project 9 - Workforce Knowledge and Competencies

Budget Table: Project 9					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$67,576.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$67,576.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$67,576.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$67,576.00

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

**Project 9 Budget Narrative**

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

With technical assistance from other sources, the state was able to accomplish much of the work that was expected to be contracted for with TA funds. Delays in the hiring process show unspent funds in Personnel, Fringe and related expenses. Those positions have since been filled.

**Project 9 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent funds forward across future years of the grant. Additionally, the state will submit amendments to use the unspent contractual funds to support the findings of the TA it received in Year One.

**Budget Table: Project 10 - Supporting Early Educators**

<b>Budget Table: Project 10</b>					
<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$24,364.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$24,364.00</b>
2. Fringe Benefits				\$14,517.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
3. Travel	\$733.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$733.00</b>
4. Equipment	\$15,510.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$15,510.00</b>
5. Supplies	\$175.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$175.00</b>
6. Contractual	\$75,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$75,000.00</b>
7. Training Stipends	\$746,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$746,300.00</b>
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$876,599.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$876,599.00</b>
10. Indirect Costs	\$4,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$4,200.00</b>
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	<b>\$880,799.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$880,799.00</b>
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$880,799.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$880,799.00</b>

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

**Project 10 Budget Narrative**

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

Due to difficulty finding qualified candidates, the state had unspent Personnel, Fringe and related costs to a position that was filled later than expected. Equipment costs were higher than expected to support the training sessions to support the mentor networks in this project. Because the state modified an existing contract to support the work of AWARDS for early educators, the payments are not aligned with the calendar of the RTT-ELC grant, showing an overspent in Contractual. Additionally, the state had more early childhood educators take advantage of the AWARDS for early educators program, thus overspending slightly in that budget line. Guidelines for the program have been revised so that funding will match demand in Year Two. Unspent Other funding was due to a delay in the need for printed guides.

**Project 10 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent funds forward across future years of the grant, and adjust future budget projections to align with what was spent in Year One.

## Budget Table: Project 11 – Kindergarten Entry Assessment

Budget Table: Project 11					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$27,333.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$27,333.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$12,276.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$120.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$120.00
6. Contractual	\$31,257.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$31,257.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$70,986.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$70,986.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$70,986.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$70,986.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$17,343.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$17,343.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	<b>\$88,329.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$88,329.00</b>

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.



**Project 11 Budget Narrative**

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

The major discrepancy between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year was in Contractual. This is due to the contract for the Kindergarten Entry Assessment being executed slightly ahead of schedule at the conclusion of Year One, rather than early Year Two as initially anticipated.

**Project 11 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent funds forward across future years of the grant, and to adjust future budget projections to align with what was spent in Year One.

Budget Table: Project 12 – Unified Data System

Budget Table: Project 12					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$29,473.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$29,473.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$17,047.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$9,629.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,629.00
5. Supplies	\$633.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$633.00
6. Contractual	\$131,744.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$131,744.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$188,526.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$188,526.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$3,618.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,618.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>13. Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$192,144.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$192,144.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$340,812.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$340,812.00
<b>15. Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$532,956.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$532,956.00

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

**Project 12 Budget Narrative**

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

DECAL was able to utilize another funding source to cover much of the contractual costs initially planned for in Year One.

**Project 12 Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent contractual funds forward across future years of the grant.