

Early Learning Challenge

2016 FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



JUNE 2017





**Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge
Final Performance Report**

CFDA Number: 84.412

California,
2016

Due: April 3, 2017

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202



Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

- 1. PR/Award #: S412A120003
2. Grantee Name (Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.): Office of Governor, State of California
3. Grantee Address State Capitol, Suite 1173, Sacramento, CA 95814
4. Project Director Name: Debra McMannis Title: Director
Ph #: 916-324-0730 Ext: (extension) Fax #: 916-323-6853
Email Address: dmcmannis@cde.ca.gov

Reporting Period Information

- 5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2016 to: 12/31/2016

Indirect Cost Information

- 6. Indirect Costs
a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? [X]Yes []No
b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government?
[X]Yes []No
c. If yes, provide the following information:
Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s):
From: 7/1/2016 to: 6/30/2017
Approving Federal agency: [X]ED []HHS []Other: please specify.
(Attach current indirect cost rate agreement to this report.)

Certification

- 7. 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));
[X]Yes
[]No

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary is the State's opportunity to tell the story of its Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grant. Reflect on your State's accomplishments over the grant period and, in a couple of pages, share (1) the vision for RTT-ELC in your State (2) What has changed in the State and in early learning programs as a result of RTT-ELC (3) the lessons learned in implementing a comprehensive reform agenda. You may also want to share planned next steps for this work. The Executive Summary should be no more than ten pages in length.

California's Race to the Top–Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) implements a unique approach that builds upon its local and statewide successes to create sustainable capacity at the local level and addresses the geographic and cultural diversity of California. Approximately 77 percent of the grant funding is being spent at the local level, via 17 original consortia and 14 mentee counties, to support the development and expansion of successful local Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) efforts focused on improved outcomes for children with high needs.

As the RTT-ELC lead agency, staff from the California Department of Education (CDE), Early Education and Support Division (EESD), along with staff from First 5 California (F5CA), have served as the RTT-ELC Implementation Team and provided Consortia and workgroup meeting planning and facilitation, technical assistance (TA) and support, and fiscal and programmatic oversight. Both locally, and at the state, progress continued on the governance structures with representatives from the Governor's Administration (Department of Finance [DOF], California Department of Social Services [CDSS], and State Board of Education [SBE]), as well as consortia members, continuing to demonstrate strong commitment and collaboration during this fourth year of implementation.

Vision

Expansion of QRIS in California took root in 2015 with RTT-ELC grant serving as a foundation that resulted in the expansion of QRIS throughout the state. In 2015, the RTT-ELC QRIS efforts transitioned to a statewide effort as a result of the release of the California State Preschool Program (CSPP) QRIS Block Grant and F5CA Improve and Maximize Programs so All Children Thrive (IMPACT) grant. During 2015, all 58 counties began participating in either one or both funding opportunities indicating program quality improvement is a major priority at the state and local level in preparing young children for lifelong success. Consortia report QRIS is now seen as the effective umbrella to connect all Quality Improvement (QI) efforts within the counties. In March 2016, the California Quality Rating Improvement System (CA-QRIS) Consortium was officially launched as the overarching entity to sustain and grow the RTT-ELC work with these new funding streams. In June 2016, a steering committee was established to provide guidance and direction for the CA-QRIS Consortium.

Changes in California and in Early Learning Programs as a Result of RTT-ELC

The most significant change for California is having a shared understanding of what we mean by high quality early learning. This shared understanding provides a platform for cross-sector and cross-state discussions of what are the key factors of quality and how can high quality early learning be promoted. Through RTT-ELC, key stakeholders are coming together in local consortia to explore how to improve the quality of early learning programs, engage more early learning and care settings, and reach out to local leaders and businesses.

A second major change was the initiation of state Master Anchors on the rating matrix tools, Teachstone's Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) and Environment Rating Scales Institute's (ERSI) family of tools. Up until the RTT-ELC interrater reliability contract with F5CA was executed in 2014, local consortia were each contracting with Teachstone and ERSI for reliability training for their

assessors at considerable expense. The interrater reliability contract bore the expense of having the three state Master Anchors trained to reliability with the authors of these tools. By having the state Master Anchors, local consortia were saved out-of-state travel expenses or high contract expenses and only needed to cover in-state training costs, freeing valuable resources for quality improvement activities. This change is credited for the significant increase in participation, as funds were freed up locally.

The participation data from the Performance Tables provide a dramatic example of the robust adoption of the RTT-ELC's tiered QRIS. California had targeted a 13 percent increase in site participation, but by the end of June 2016, the actual site participation was at over 19 percent, exceeding our target by 45 percent. Similarly, California exceeded its target for those at Tiers 4 and 5 by 77 percent and 8.5 percent, respectively. California had targeted a 16 percent increase in children with high needs in the top tiers, but by the end of June 2016, the actual number of children was at over 25 percent, exceeding our target by 54 percent.

Changes that were made in early learning programs due to RTT-ELC include the willingness to have assessors come into their sites, embracing of coaching to support continuous quality improvement, establishing communities of practice within a site or among family child care home providers, and the willingness to communicate their participation in QRIS and program ratings. Precursors of RTT-ELC were F5CA's Power of Preschool and Child Signature Program, both of which focused on classrooms, not sites. With RTT-ELC, lessons learned from one classroom were shared with others at the site, and disparity of funding was ameliorated to support the entire site's quality improvement efforts.

Lessons learned in implementing a comprehensive reform agenda

As noted in previous Annual Performance Reports, lessons learned related to leveraging, relationships, and tailoring. With RTT-ELC, each local consortium began to take a systems look at how they were implementing QRIS. Each of the consortia made significant progress in leveraging their RTT-ELC funding with local funding, leveraging state quality improvement professional development systems, (e.g., Program for Infant/Toddler Care and California Preschool Instructional Network, with local coaching efforts, and leveraging community resources as their local child care resource and referral agencies, local libraries, and community colleges). This leveraging was accomplished by aligning program requirements, tweaking systems for efficiency, and blending resources to maximize efforts.

A second lesson would be more progress can be made when strong relationships have been built. Prior to RTT-ELC, many county First 5s were implementing programs and services to support young children and their families with little connection to the CDE or its early childhood resources. In working together through RTT-ELC, trusting relationships have been built at the local and state level that allowed us to be more responsive to each other, as exemplified by role of the State's early learning standards (foundations) in the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Pathways and the moving from a block system to a hybrid block and points rating system after the first year. Relationships were also strengthened through the Integrated Action Team which brought together

participating state agencies with Consortia representatives. The shared leadership displayed by the CDE and F5CA modeled shared leadership in the local consortia.

Lastly, California's state to local implementation brought about change at a much greater rate because local implementers were about to tailor the RTT-ELC requirements to needs of their communities and their child care providers. In some communities, this meant more focused attention on young dual language learners. In others, it meant concerted outreach to family child care home providers creating opportunities for support. Rather than controlling everything from the state level, local QRIS administrators took responsibility to make adaptations that fits within the common quality continuum framework to be responsive to their local needs.

Next Steps

In March 2016, California launched the CA-QRIS Consortium building on RTT-ELC and expanding to all 58 counties. Short-term plans include the CA-QRIS Consortium deciding on a CA-QRIS name, logo and tag line and launching a Web site that is parent-friendly, allowing easily understood information about QRIS, county-specific information, and resources. Future plans include refining the CQI Pathways, examining the rating matrix for modifications, refining the Implementation Guide, and conducting case study evaluations. As the local QRISs, regional hubs, and state support team work together, California hopes to see greater efficiencies, fuller participation, while maintaining a focus on systems building.

Core Areas

A. Successful State Systems

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

Overall Accomplishments

Reflect and relate your accomplishments during the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period in aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State.

Please report on your progress against all applicable goals, targets, and projects in the State's application. Provide an overall assessment of your grant implementation (you may want to explain the major accomplishments in the projects you outlined in your RTT-ELC Project Plan, identify strategies used, and how identified challenges and lessons learned will inform future work). Discuss how RTT-ELC funds contributed to project goals and outcomes. Include evidence and data to support your discussion (e.g., tools created, student outcomes, survey results, changes in instructional practice).

Major Accomplishments

- Built and strengthened partnerships across the fields of early learning, child health, and family strengthening
- Developed capacity across the state for Early Childhood Education (ECE) training, technical assistance (TA), and assessing and improving the quality of early learning programs
- Provided families with clear quality standards they can use to make informed decisions when choosing child care
- Served as the foundation and catalyst for new state funding for QRIS: California State Preschool Program (CSPP) QRIS Block Grant, Infant/Toddler QRIS Block Grant, and First 5 IMPACT
- RTT-ELC funds contributed to project goals

Governance Structure

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

During 2016, California's RTT-ELC governance structure continued to function as illustrated in the organizational chart, which was described in California's approved application, with First 5 California (F5CA) taking on a shared leadership role. As stated in previous annual performance reports, this structure builds on California's strategy of interagency collaboration and governance and provides opportunities to further strengthen and enhance this strategy through the RTT-ELC grant. With active participation from the various state agencies and the RTT-ELC Regional Leadership Consortia (Consortia), California has created channels to improve and align state and local systems that serve children with high needs, ages birth to five years. When referring to the Consortia, it means the representatives were involved in the 17 local Consortia. These representatives include the key decision makers (the person within the local consortium who has the authority to make the final decisions) as well as program and fiscal staff. The Consortia is the decision making body with guidance from the state RTT-ELC Implementation Team on issues involving local implementation, specifically the Quality Continuum Framework. Decisions have been reached using a consensus approach.

The following subsections describe the major organizational levels of the governance structure and discuss 2016 major activities and/or functions.

California Administration: Office of the Governor, State Board of Education, and California Department of Education

Representatives from the Governor's Administration (i.e., DOF and SBE) continued to be involved in major policy issues pertaining to California's implementation of the RTT-ELC grant. In 2016, these representatives received periodic updates and developed California's early learning program budgets. They also, participated in reviewing the funding formula and program plans to implement legislation enacted in California's Fiscal Year (FY) 2014–15 Budget Act process (Trailer Bill - Senate Bill 858), that established a state QRIS Block Grant program for California's State Preschool Program (CSPP) and establishing it in the California *Education Code*. This CSPP QRIS Block Grant is now in its third round, enabling local educational agencies (LEAs) to participate more fully in their local QRIS to increase the number of low-income children receiving high-quality state preschool program experiences and to reward those State Preschool sites that are at Tiers 4 and 5 with local block grants.

Within the CDE, the Early Education and Support Division (EESD) continued to lead the RTT-ELC grant activities and oversaw 11 contracts or interagency agreements that enhance the ability to strengthen the quality of local early learning and care programs.

RTT-ELC Implementation Team

The CDE EESD partners with F5CA, another state agency, in supporting the Consortia. The state RTT-ELC Leadership Team is comprised of the two agency's directors and two of the agency's top administrators who oversee and direct the work of the RTT-ELC Implementation Team (Team). The Team consists of staff from each agency working in concert with one another to carry out the numerous tasks associated with administration of the grant. This partnership continued to model state agency coordination and collaboration between the two agencies that have the major

responsibility for serving this child population in early learning and care settings for the State of California. The Team continued to be the key body that plans and supports Consortia RTT-ELC implementation in compliance with California's approved application. The Team met weekly to plan upcoming tasks and/or meetings, to make staff assignments, and to communicate/discuss progress, issues, policy clarification, and other pertinent information.

In 2016, the Team's focus was on facilitating the transition from RTT-ELC to CA-QRIS. Several financial augmentations to the QRIS landscape promoted this transition. One was the annual appropriation of \$50 million in state education funds for the CSPP QRIS Block Grant. In January 2016, the CDE released a Request for Application for \$24,163 million over two years for Infant/Toddler (I/T) QRIS Block Grants, which were awarded to 35 county grantees. A significant addition was First 5 IMPACT (Improve and Maximize Programs so All Children Thrive), http://www.cfc.ca.gov/programs/programs_impact.html, which provides \$190 million over five years for local and state quality improvement efforts to promote and optimize their children's development and learning, both inside and outside the home. The First 5 IMPACT has three levels, from quality improvement to QRIS. All 58 counties are participating at some level. This is a broad program that engages multiple sectors and provides regional support through F5CA liaisons and regional hubs. Late in 2016, the CDE added Migrant QRIS Block Grants to the CSPP QRIS Block Grants and CA-QRIS Certification Grants to the regional hubs.

The year of 2016 was one of transition. On March 16, 2016, the Team convened counties who were just beginning to embark on QRIS to provide an orientation day which traced California's QRIS history from 2003 to RTT-ELC, and its rating matrix, continuous quality improvement (CQI) pathways (Pathways), Implementation Guide, and assessor management system. The following day, the Team convened the Consortia, its mentees, and CSPP QRIS Block Grantees and IMPACT grantees to officially launch new California QRIS (CA-QRIS) Consortium, to identify local and statewide actions to move forward the QRIS effort, and to identify topics of interest for future meetings and continued planning. The assembled members adopted a governance structure with three representative from each of the ten F5CA IMPACT regions that was proposed at the December 2015 meeting. The Team facilitated the transition from a role of implementing the RTT-ELC grant to supporting the newly established CA-QRIS Consortium. At the June 29, 2016, CA-QRIS Consortium meeting, the Team facilitated the first vote of the regional representatives to determine the composition of a planning committee. It was also the occasion to celebrate the original RTT-ELC Consortia members, as that portion of the grant ended. The October 20, 2016, meeting was an opportunity to begin discussion in the four key workgroup areas: (1) Communications, (2) Rating Matrix, (3) CQI Pathways, and (4) Evaluation, and to have more in-depth peer learning.

The Team supported the Consortia with transition issues and how to leverage all available funding streams and state services to support local QRIS implementation. During 2016, all 58 of California's counties were participating in quality improvement at some level, with the vast majority (49) having QRIS plans on file at the state level.

State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care

California's Governor appointed members to the State Advisory Council (SAC) that represent a broad range of state and local agencies and organizations involved in the education and care of young children and early learning programs. The SAC members represent fields of education, social services, health and mental health, higher education, and tribal organizations; members are listed on the SAC Members Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ce/sacmembers.asp>. One of the governor's appointees also administers a RTT-ELC consortium and serves as a liaison between the SAC and the Consortia. Another appointee formerly administered a consortium and continues to provide a RTT-ELC perspective to the SAC.

In 2016, the SAC held four meetings (January, April, July, and October). The SAC agendas focused on various topics pertaining to the education and care of young children. The major discussions centered on state and federal updates, emphasizing legislative, Head Start, and state QRIS efforts, including the RTT-ELC Grant, CSPP QRIS Block Grant, the I/T QRIS Block Grant, F5CA's IMPACT Grant, and challenges with using proprietary assessment tools. In addition the SAC members heard several presentations, including one on the state "Talk, Read, Sing" campaign, the impact of minimum wage increases, the CDE/EESD stakeholder input process and recommendations, and the "Are You In?" research findings on family child care participation in quality improvement activities.

As a follow-up from the previous year's discussion on the federal poverty rate limitation on meeting the needs of California's neediest children and families and the high cost of child care, especially in high-cost urban areas, a draft letter to the Governor was presented and discussed at the January meeting. The SAC voted to submit finalized letter at the April meeting; it was sent to the Governor on April 14, 2016.

Participating State Agencies

Throughout the RTT-ELC grant, representatives from Participating State Agencies (PSAs), the Consortia, and Team assembled as the Early Learning Challenge Integrated Action Team (ELC/IAT). This body was charged with active coordination on an implementation level of the key activities and initiatives described in California's RTT-ELC application.

In 2016, with the focus on sustainability and transition from RTT-ELC to CA-QRIS, the ELC/IAT did not meet. The value of state agency representatives meeting and discussing issues with local QRIS implementers was significant. Hope was expressed that some body, such as the ELC/IAT, would continue to meet to explore solutions to implementation challenges caused by regulations, or the lack of coordination.

Since 2013, F5CA moved from being a participating state agency to partner as part of the implementation team. See RTT-ELC Implementation Team description above.

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 four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period .

As reported in the previous Annual Performance Reports, there are numerous entities throughout California that are involved and/or keenly interested in early learning and care programs/initiatives for young children. A sampling of these entities include legislative and regulatory governmental bodies, state agencies, professional organizations, advocacy groups, foundations, early learning and care program providers, higher education personnel, and general interested parties.

In January 2016, both CDE and F5CA held a joint QRIS Legislative Staff Briefing that provided an overview of QRIS nationally and California specifically. CDE provided information on the CSPP QRIS Block Grant and the Infant/Toddler QRIS Block Grant and F5CA provided an overview of its IMPACT grant. Several implementers from various regions and organizations provided a panel perspective on their QRIS efforts.

The Team has learned that the most effective way to involve stakeholders is meeting them face-to-face and sharing California's RTT-ELC story. As in the past years, the Team accepted invitations to address stakeholders or professional organizations or any interested group about California's RTT-ELC program: (1) its design, (2) its progress, and (3) the lessons learned. Members of the Team presented to a variety of groups throughout the year, both within the state and at national conferences. Presentations were given at the QRIS National Meeting, National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) National Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development, California Alternative Payment Program Association and Resource and Referral Network Joint Annual Conference, the California Child Care Coordinators Association, and California Child Development Administrators Conference among others. QRIS was at the center of all these presentations, both through a general lens and more specifically around workforce development and developmental screening.

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had an impact on or was the result of the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact.

Actions related to the Budget Act of 2016

Rates

The Budget Act of 2016 requires that the beginning January 1, 2017, Regional Market Rate (RMR) ceilings should be based on the greater of either of the following: (1) the 75th percentile of the 2014 RMR survey or (2) the RMR ceilings as they existed prior to December 31, 2016.

The standard reimbursement rate (SRR) for FY 2016–17 CSPP contracts is \$40.45 and for General Child Care and Development (CCTR) contracts is \$40.20. Both of the SRRs reflect a blended rate, as the Budget Act of 2016 increased the SRR mid-year (i.e. a rate increase effective January 1, 2017). Since a contract cannot be issued with two different rates, a blended rate was used for FY 2016–17.

For those agencies/contracts participating in the county’s respective pilots, the rates for FY 2016–17 are as follows:

County	CCTR SRR	CSPP SRR
San Francisco	\$42.82	\$43.10
San Mateo	\$43.41	\$43.67
Alameda	\$42.92	\$43.43
Oakland USD only	\$43.31	

As with all of the other contracts, the rates in the table represent a blended rate for FY 2016–17.

License-exempt providers will be reimbursed at 70 percent of the licensed family child care home providers (up from 65 percent) as of January 1, 2017.

Part-day California State Preschool Program

Allow a child with exceptional needs whose families exceed income eligibility guidelines access to part-day state preschool if all other eligible children have been served. This allows part-day state preschool providers the flexibility to fill unused slots with other students who would benefit from early intervention education.

Full-day California State Preschool Program

2016 Budget Act increases 2,959 slots of full-day state preschool beginning April 1, 2017, and propose the FY 2017–18 Governor’s Budget pauses the addition of 2,959 full-day state preschool slots planned to begin on April 1, 2018.

Eliminate licensing requirements for state preschool programs utilizing facilities that meet transitional kindergarten facility standards, specifically K-12 public school buildings.

Allow state preschool programs flexibility in meeting minimum adult-to-student ratios and teacher education requirements, allowing for alignment with transitional kindergarten requirements.

CalWORKs¹ and the Alternative Payment Program

Stage 2: An increase of \$35.8 million non-Proposition 98 General Fund in FY 2017–18 to reflect increases in both the number of CalWORKs Stage 2 cases and the cost per case. Total cost for Stage 2 is \$505 million.

Stage 3: An increase of \$1.6 million non-Proposition 98 General Fund in 2017–18 to reflect an increase in the cost per case, despite a decline in the number of CalWORKs Stage 3 cases. Total cost for Stage 3 is \$302.5 million.

Quality Investments

The FY 2016–17 Budget Act requires CDE to develop a new quality funding expenditure plan by March 1, 2017, as an amendment to the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) state plan. This expenditure plan should comply with CCDBG requirements, and the plan should prioritize activities that support the QRIS and expresses legislative intent that the state use funding from the federal CCDBG quality allocation to support the QRIS, to the greatest extent possible. It also requires the plan to maintain funding for resource and referral agencies, local planning councils, and licensing enforcement.

Federal Child Care and Development and TANF Funds

A net increase of \$4.8 million federal Child Care and Development and \$120.1 million federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds in FY 2017–18. The total federal funding is \$736.6 million.

Actions Related to the Legislation from the Fiscal Year 2016–17 Session

Assembly Bill (AB) 1712 (Oberholte): Child care: Contractors: Digital Signatures to Title 5 Contractors

The Child Care and Development Services Act, administered by the CDE, provides that children from infancy to 13 years of age are eligible, with certain requirements, for child care and development services. The act authorizes the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to enter into and execute

local contractual agreements with any public or private entity or agency for the delivery of child care and development services. The act authorizes these contractors to maintain records electronically. This bill would authorize the contractors to use a digital signature, as provided, and would require that the use of a digital signature have the same force and effect as a manual signature if specified requirements are met. The bill would require the use of a digital signature to be in compliance with state and federal standards, as determined by the department. More information can be found on the Management Bulletin 17-04 Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ci/mb1704.asp>.

Assembly Bill (AB) 2036 (Lopez): Online Child Care Job Posting Services: Background Check Service Providers: Enforcement

This bill would require an online child care job posting service providing online information about non-licensed potential child care providers to include a specified statement regarding the Trustline registry on its Internet Web site in California. The bill would also require an online child care job posting service providing online information about licensed potential child care providers to include a statement regarding a parent's right to specified complaint information on its Internet Web site in California. If an online child care job posting service provides access to a background check, the bill would require the service to include on its Internet Web site in California, a written description of the background check provided by the background check service provider. The bill would make a background check service provider responsible for providing the online child care job posting service with certain information. The bill would authorize an online child care job posting service or background check service provider to be liable for a civil penalty for failing to comply with these requirements and would authorize the Attorney General, a city attorney, or a county counsel to bring such an action if certain requirements are met. The bill would also authorize an individual damaged by willful violation of these provisions to bring a civil cause of action for damages, as provided.

Assembly Bill (AB) 2296 (Low): Digital Signatures

This bill would express the intent of the Legislature to clarify that a digital signature may be used to satisfy the requirements of an electronic signature under the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act. The bill would, for purposes of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act, provide that an electronic signature includes a digital signature under the above described provisions of the Government Code and that a digital signature under those provisions is a type of an electronic signature as set forth in the Uniform Electronic Transaction Act. The bill would also revise the above-described provisions of the Government Code by specifying that if a public entity elects to use a digital signature, that meets specified requirements, the digital signature has the same force and effect of a manual signature in any communication with the public entity. More information can be found on the Management Bulletin 17-03 Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ci/mb1703.asp>.

Assembly Bill (AB) 2368 (Gordon): Child care and development Services: Individualized County Child Care Subsidy Plan: County of Santa Clara.

This bill would authorize, until January 1, 2022, the County of Santa Clara to develop and implement an individualized county child care subsidy plan, as specified. The bill would require the plan to be submitted to the local planning council and the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors for approval, as specified. The bill would require the Early Education and Support Division of the CDE to review and approve or disapprove the plan and any subsequent modifications to the plan. The bill would require the County of Santa Clara to annually prepare and submit to the Legislature, the State Department of Social Services, and the CDE a report that contains specified information relating to the success of the county's plan.

¹ California's Welfare-to-Work program.

Participating State Agencies

Describe any changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in the State Plan during the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period.

The California Department of Public Health (CDPH), the SAC, F5CA, and the SBE continued their involvement in the RTT-ELC grant as defined in their scopes of work. Four of the PSAs have an interagency agreement with the CDE to complete tasks associated with their area of expertise that will enhance or support raising the quality of early learning programs. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) used RTT-ELC funds to improve its licensing Web site to include educational and training materials for consumers and child care providers, which can be found on the California Child Care Licensing Resources for Parents and Providers Web site at <https://cclld.childcarevideos.org/>. These brief videos provide more consistent understanding of licensing requirements so consumers and child care providers have a resource where they can get information about 25 child care topics. The California Department of Developmental Services (CDDS) met its interagency agreement by coordinating training for early intervention program staff and support implementation of best practices in developmental and health screening at the local level in collaboration with the Consortia.

The F5CA has used RTT-ELC funds to develop a system of master anchors to provide support to the consortia members for Classroom Assessment and Scoring System (CLASS®) and Environment Rating Scale (ERS) assessors and for inter-rater reliability training. This inter-agency agreement with F5CA is in addition to F5CA's in-kind contribution staff resources to the Leadership and Implementation Teams. In November, 2016, F5CA held a pre-summit day to its 2016 Child Health, Education, and Care Summit that was focused on QRIS, which local implementers sharing strategies and breakout sessions to allow opportunities to go deeper.

All of the above mentioned PSAs along with California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the State Interagency Coordinating Council for Part C of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) have been members of the IAT.

B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs

Overall Accomplishments

Reflect and relate your accomplishments during the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period in the area of improving quality in early learning programs in your State, including development and use of a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS).

Please report on your progress against all applicable goals, targets, and projects in the State's application. Provide an overall assessment of your grant implementation (you may want to explain the major accomplishments in the projects you outlined in your RTT-ELC Project Plan, identify strategies used, and how identified challenges and lessons learned will inform future work). Discuss how RTT-ELC funds contributed to project goals and outcomes. Include evidence and data to support your discussion (e.g., tools created, student outcomes, survey results, changes in instructional practice).

California continued to anchor our work to the our Early Learning and Development Standards, The California Preschool Learning Foundations, as they outline key knowledge and skills that most children can achieve when provided with the kinds of developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate interactions, instruction, and environments that research has shown to promote early learning and development. The foundations can provide early childhood educators, parents, and the public with a clear understanding of the wide range of knowledge and skills that preschool children typically attain when given the benefits of a high-quality preschool program.

California continued to include a developmental and behavioral screening with follow-up (ASQ and ASQ-SE) and ongoing observational child assessment (DRDP 2010) in our Comprehensive Assessment System. CA has offered hundreds of trainings in both the ASQ, ASQ-SE and DRDP, and increased capacity of this work by creating Trainer of Trainers (TOT) models. The \$2 million QRIS CSPP Certification Block Grants have helped to maintain and build capacity in this work on a regional level.

California continued to strengthen our Early Childhood Educator Qualifications as evidenced the CA Competencies. From when the California Competencies Mapping Tool became operational in 2014 to December of 2016, there has been an increase of 159 mapped courses that brings the total number of mapped courses to 651. In 2016, there were a total of 72 trainings that have been mapped with the Competencies via the web-based Mapping Tool.

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

Please check all that apply – The State’s TQRIS is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that address or are aligned with:

- Early learning and development standards
- A comprehensive assessment system
- Early childhood educator qualifications
- Family engagement strategies
- Health promotion practices
- Effective data practices

Describe progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation in **developing or revising** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards.

In 2016, California continued to implement the Quality Continuum Framework based on tools and resources from the original Framework that was described in its application. The Framework includes common, research-based elements, tools, and resources grouped into three core areas: (1) Child Development and School Readiness, (2) Teachers and Teaching, and (3) Program and Environment. California's Rating Matrix combines a block system at lower levels with points at higher tiers.

The document below illustrates the elements and resources included in each core area in the TQRIS.

California's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge – Quality Continuum Framework	
Common QRIS Elements	Common Tools and Resources
1. CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SCHOOL READINESS	
<p>a. Early Learning and Development Standards to include developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate teaching strategies, interactions and environments.</p> <p>b. Comprehensive Assessment System to include a developmental and behavioral screening with follow-up and ongoing observational child assessment.</p> <p>c. Health Promotion Practices to include mental health and health screening.</p>	<p>a. The <i>California Infant/Toddler Learning Development Foundations</i> and <i>Preschool Learning Foundations</i></p> <p>The companion CDE Curriculum Framework documents</p> <p>The Preschool English Learner (PEL) Guide</p> <p>b. Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) 2010</p> <p>Desired Results Developmental Profile – School Readiness (DRDP-SR)</p> <p>Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) or comparable, validated screening tool.</p> <p>c. The <i>California Infant/Toddler Learning and Development Foundations</i>, the <i>Preschool Learning Foundations</i> and companion curriculum framework documents</p> <p>A valid and reliable health and mental health screener</p> <p>Environment Rating Scales (ERS) family of tools</p> <p>Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) pyramid model</p> <p>DSS/CCL Title 22 health and safety licensing standards</p> <p>The USDA Child and Adult Care Food Program Guidelines</p>

California's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge – Quality Continuum Framework

Common QRIS Elements	Common Tools and Resources
2. TEACHERS AND TEACHING	
<p>a. Early Childhood Educator Qualifications</p> <p>b. Effective Teacher-Child Interactions</p>	<p>a. Common Core Curriculum-aligned 8 lower division courses</p> <p>CDE Competencies Self-Reflective tool (available 2012-13)</p> <p>Professional Growth Plans as required by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC).</p> <p>b. Classroom Assessment Scoring System™ (CLASS™) family of tools</p> <p>Program Assessment Rating Scale (PARS)</p> <p>ERS</p>
3. PROGRAM AND ENVIRONMENT	
<p>a. Licensing and Regulatory Requirements to include both DSS/CCL Title 22 and CDE Title 5 regulatory requirements.</p> <p>b. Program Administration and Leadership</p> <p>c. Family Engagement</p> <p>d. Effective Data Practices</p>	<p>a. Title 22 (DSS)</p> <p>Title 5 (CDE)</p> <p>b. ERS</p> <p>Program Administration Scale (PAS)</p> <p>Business Administration Scale (BAS); (See section D).</p> <p>c. ERS</p> <p><i>Strengthening Families</i>™ Five Protective Factors</p> <p>d. National Data Quality Campaign's Framework</p>

In 2016, Implementation Team staff, including State Anchors on CLASS and Environment Rating Scales (ERS) tools worked with the Consortia to provide TA on Rating Matrix implementation and provided substantial training on both tools. An Assessor Handbook was developed, which will be made available to the state after the Consortia approve the content. More detail on the work this group has accomplished can be found in the section “Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs” (Section B(3) of Application).

Due to the hybrid nature of the TQRIS, the first tier is blocked and the additional Common Tiers are based on point values. Each consortium determined how local Tiers 2 and 5 would be defined on its local TQRIS, and decided whether these tiers would be blocked or point-based. While a few consortia have additional local criteria and others have pending stakeholder meetings to determine the local

nuances of local Tiers 2 and 5, the majority are moving forward with the points in the Hybrid Matrix as set by the Consortia for the first year of implementation. There seemed to be a common philosophy that most consortia wanted no additional local criteria in order to keep a simple, streamlined continuum that is easy to understand. A few consortia kept the same criteria but required meeting additional criteria in their highest tier.

During 2016, the QRIS continued to be in a fully operational phase. In May of 2015, the Consortia agreed to modify the sixth element, ERS element, of the rating matrix to be implemented no later than September 2015. For the 3-point value, the requirement to have an outside ERS assessment completed with an overall score of 4.0 or higher has been removed. The new requirement is an assessment on the whole tool (self-assessment, coach assessment, or outside assessment are all acceptable) and results are used to inform the site's QI plan. The 5-point value now NAEYC accreditation in lieu of ERS rating at the 5-point level. No other substantive changes were made to the Matrix. Below is the Hybrid Rating Matrix with Three Common Tiers.

CALIFORNIA QUALITY RATING AND IMPROVEMENT SYSTEM (CA-QRIS) QUALITY CONTINUUM FRAMEWORK –RATING MATRIX WITH ELEMENTS AND POINTS FOR CONSORTIA COMMON TIERS 1, 3, AND 4					
ELEMENT	BLOCK (Common Tier 1) Licensed In-Good-Standing	2 POINTS	3 POINTS	4 POINTS	5 POINTS
CORE I: CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SCHOOL READINESS					
1. Child Observation	<input type="checkbox"/> Not required	<input type="checkbox"/> Program uses evidence-based child assessment/observation tool annually that covers all five domains of development	<input type="checkbox"/> Program uses valid and reliable child assessment/ observation tool aligned with CA Foundations & Frameworks ¹ twice a year	<input type="checkbox"/> DRDP (minimum twice a year) and results used to inform curriculum planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Program uses DRDP twice a year and uploads into DRDP Tech and results used to inform curriculum planning
2. Developmental and Health Screenings	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Title 22 Regulations	<input type="checkbox"/> Health Screening Form (Community Care Licensing form LIC 701 "Physician's Report - Child Care Centers" or equivalent) used at entry, then: 1. Annually OR 2. Ensures vision and hearing screenings are conducted annually	<input type="checkbox"/> Program works with families to ensure screening of all children using a valid and reliable developmental screening tool at entry and as indicated by results thereafter AND <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Criteria from point level 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Program works with families to ensure screening of all children using the ASQ & ASQ-SE, if indicated, at entry, then as indicated by results thereafter AND <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Criteria from point level 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Program works with families to ensure screening of all children using the ASQ & ASQ-SE, if indicated, at entry, then as indicated by results thereafter AND <input type="checkbox"/> Program staff uses children's screening results to make referrals and implement intervention strategies and adaptations as appropriate AND <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Criteria from point level 2
CORE II: TEACHERS AND TEACHING					
3. Minimum Qualifications for Lead Teacher/ Family Child Care Home (FCCH)	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Title 22 Regulations (Center: 12 units of Early Childhood Education (ECE)/Child Development (CD) FCCH: 15 hours of training on preventive health practices)	<input type="checkbox"/> Center: 24 units of ECE/CD ² OR Associate Teacher Permit <input type="checkbox"/> FCCH: 12 units of ECE/CD OR Associate Teacher Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> 24 units of ECE/CD + 16 units of General Education OR Teacher Permit AND <input type="checkbox"/> 21 hours professional development (PD) annually	<input type="checkbox"/> Associate's degree (AA/AS) in ECE/CD (or closely related field) OR AA/AS in any field plus 24 units of ECE/CD OR Site Supervisor Permit AND <input type="checkbox"/> 21 hours PD annually	<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's degree in ECE/CD (or closely related field) OR BA/BS in any field plus/with 24 units of ECE/CD (or master's degree in ECE/CD) OR Program Director Permit AND <input type="checkbox"/> 21 hours PD annually
4. Effective Teacher–Child Interactions: CLASS Assessments (Use tool for appropriate age group as available)	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Required	<input type="checkbox"/> Familiarity with CLASS for appropriate age group as available by one representative from the site	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent CLASS assessment by reliable observer to inform the program's professional development/improvement plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent CLASS assessment by reliable observer with minimum CLASS scores: Pre-K • Emotional Support – 5 • Instructional Support – 3 • Classroom Organization – 5 Toddler • Emotional & Behavioral Support – 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent assessment with CLASS with minimum CLASS scores: Pre-K • Emotional Support – 5.5 • Instructional Support – 3.5 • Classroom Organization – 5.5 Toddler • Emotional & Behavioral Support – 5.5 • Engaged Support for Learning – 4 Infant • Responsive Caregiving (RC) – 5.5

1. Approved assessments are: Creative Curriculum GOLD, Early Learning Scale by National Institute of Early Education Research (NIEER), and Brigance Inventory of Early Development III.

2. For all ECE/CD units, the core eight are desired but not required.

Note: Point values are not indicative of Tiers 1–5 but reflect a range of points that can be earned toward assigning a tier rating (see Total Point Range).

ELEMENT	BLOCK (Common Tier 1) Licensed In-Good-Standing	2 POINTS	3 POINTS	4 POINTS	5 POINTS
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engaged Support for Learning – 3.5 ▪ Infant ▪ Responsive Caregiving (RC) – 5.0 	
CORE III: PROGRAM AND ENVIRONMENT - Administration and Leadership					
5. Ratios and Group Size (Centers Only beyond licensing regulations)	<input type="checkbox"/> Center: Title 22 Regulations Infant Ratio of 1:4 Toddler Option Ratio of 1:6 Preschool Ratio of 1:12 <input type="checkbox"/> FCCH: Title 22 Regulations <i>(excluded from point values in ratio and group size)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Center - Ratio: Group Size Infant/Toddler – 4:16 Toddler – 3:18 Preschool – 3:36	<input type="checkbox"/> Center - Ratio: Group Size Infant/Toddler – 3:12 Toddler – 2:12 Preschool – 2:24	<input type="checkbox"/> Center - Ratio: Group Size Infant/Toddler – 3:12 or 2:8 Toddler – 2:10 Preschool – 3:24 or 2:20	<input type="checkbox"/> Center - Ratio: Group Size Infant/Toddler – 3:9 or better Toddler – 3:12 or better Preschool – 1:8 ratio and group size of no more than 20
6. Program Environment Rating Scale(s) (Use tool for appropriate setting: ECERS-R, ITERS-R, FOCERS-R)	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Required	<input type="checkbox"/> Familiarity with ERS and every classroom uses ERS as a part of a Quality Improvement Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment on the whole tool. Results used to inform the program's Quality Improvement Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent ERS assessment. All subscales completed and averaged to meet overall score level of 5.0	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent ERS assessment. All subscales completed and averaged to meet overall score level of 5.5 OR Current National Accreditation approved by the California Department of Education
7. Director Qualifications (Centers Only)	<input type="checkbox"/> 12 units ECE/CD + 3 units management/ administration	<input type="checkbox"/> 24 units ECE/CD + 16 units General Education +/with 3 units management/ administration OR Master Teacher Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Associate's degree with 24 units ECE/CD +/with 6 units management/ administration and 2 units supervision OR Site Supervisor Permit AND <input type="checkbox"/> 21 hours PD annually	<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's degree with 24 units ECE/CD +/with 8 units management/ administration OR Program Director Permit AND <input type="checkbox"/> 21 hours PD annually	<input type="checkbox"/> Master's degree with 30 units ECE/CD including specialized courses +/with 8 units management/ administration, OR Administrative Credential AND <input type="checkbox"/> 21 hours PD annually
TOTAL POINT RANGES					
Program Type	Common-Tier 1	Local-Tier 2³	Common-Tier 3	Common-Tier 4	Local-Tier 5⁴
Centers 7 Elements for 35 points	Blocked (No Point Value) – Must Meet All Elements	Point Range 8 to 19	Point Range 20 to 25	Point Range 26 to 31	Point Range 32 and above
FCCHs 5 Elements for 25 points	Blocked (No Point Value) – Must Meet All Elements	Point Range 6 to 13	Point Range 14 to 17	Point Range 18 to 21	Point Range 22 and above

3. Local-Tier 2: Local decision if Blocked or Points and if there are additional elements.

4. Local-Tier 5: Local decision if there are additional elements included California Department of Education, February 2014 updated on May 28, 2015; effective July 1, 2015.

In 2016, the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Pathways (Pathways), the companion document to the Rating Matrix, has remained unchanged and, the Consortia reported that their coaches are still using the document as a guide for continuous QI and Professional Development (PD) at the site level. With the sunsetting of the RTT-ELC Grant and the transition into the CA-QRIS, workgroups for the Rating Matrix and the Pathways were formed and convened. They were tasked to review and refine the current Rating Matrix as well as to add resources to the Pathways.

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

Describe progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation in promoting participation in the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period and the No-Cost Extension period.

Promoting participation in the TQRIS has been a journey that started with reluctance of early learning and development program providers to commit to the development of a statewide TQRIS.

In 2012, the reluctance on the part of early learning and development program providers—especially family child care home (FCCH)—to participate was greater than anticipated. Many stakeholders were skeptical of a TQRIS and many programs were reluctant to sign on to the local TQRIS without fully knowing the quality elements, participation requirements, and expectations. In addition, the potential broadcasting of ratings was much more frightening for providers than expected. In response to these concerns, some consortia have shifted more of their focus on planning for communication with providers, including more discussions about the benefits of participation. At the time, there was a sense that the finalized TQRIS would be more conducive to diverse providers—including FCCH. Yet even with this resistance, the State Implementation Team and the local consortia persevered.

In 2013, each Consortia focused on creating easily accessible and streamlined programs that sought to make participation a positive experience, and strove to engage and outreach to sites using trusted staff with established relationships with local providers. Consortia members attribute their success in promoting participation to having established quality support systems, partnering with other quality improvement efforts, or responding quickly to participation barriers. Even with this success, some consortia still struggled with site participation due to fluctuating enrollment in the early learning and development programs, program closures, and the complexity of quality improvement work. Because of this, each consortium developed a variety of strategies to ensure measurable progress in TQRIS participation which they would use throughout the life of the grant. Strategies include: incentives for site participation and individual participation; partnership with workforce support and professional development programs; research-based professional development and coaching practices; achievement awards for programs reaching tier thresholds (determined locally); non-monetary incentives (such as free advertising for their programs on the local TQRIS website); targeted outreach to program types that are often harder to engage providers (such as private and FCCH); targeted outreach to hard-to-reach and high need communities; community engagement through presentations; and expanded locally-funded quality improvement initiative to support an increase of early learning and development programs achieving higher levels of quality.

In 2014, a State Implementation Team Liaison (State Liaison) was assigned to each consortium to help them address the challenges faced in implementing the TQRIS, including promoting participation. The State Liaisons established their roles and responsibilities and attended weekly State Liaison meetings. These meetings provided consistency in messaging and technical assistance to the Consortia in a meaningful and comprehensive manner. The State Liaisons worked together to establish a validation protocol, presented an overview of the protocol and conducted validation visits. These validation visits were crucial to assist each State Liaison with understanding firsthand information about the challenges and successes in recruiting and retaining participating programs.

State Liaisons facilitated the sharing and connecting of consortia regarding lessons learned. For example, El Dorado County shared their language and literacy instruction efforts through the use of their local libraries to engage community partners in their local TQRIS. A presentation of this work

was highlighted at the September 2014 Consortia meeting. Consortia heard about how Early Childhood Literacy Specialists (Library staff) engaged child care providers by asking if they would like to participate in the RTT-ELC Grant program. “As part of the RTT-ELC program, providers will receive incentives to support language rich environments in their programs.”

In the final year, the State Liaisons continued to provide guidance to their assigned consortia in order to assist them with meeting their performance targets for promoting site participation. This effort has increased the number of California sites participating in TQRIS to 3,278, which exceeded the 2015 goal by 812 sites or 33 percent.

Supported by their State Liaisons, the Consortia continued to employ strategies to promote site participation in the TQRIS at the local level focusing on outreach and education. Fresno and Orange counties were able to leverage their existing sites as "champions of the TQRIS system" to invite neighboring sites to participate. For Orange county, this meant being able to add an additional 193 sites in 2015. As outreach continued and participation in the TQRIS grew in San Francisco, they found the need to augment their rating capacity for language accessibility for the city's providers, specifically in Spanish and Chinese, to reflect the local community. Ventura and Sacramento have been so successful in their recruitment of new programs for participation that they have had to create a waiting list due to reaching funding capacity.

Much of the Consortia's success with promoting participation in the TQRIS has been due to educating providers about the meaning, importance, and intention behind a growing statewide TQRIS and the role in early learning communities.

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

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. Grantees will need to populate the table using last year’s APR data and include data on “Actuals” for the No-Cost Extension period.

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	ACTUALS																	
	Number and Percent of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS																	
	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5		
	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	3,127	28	0.90%	3,127	177	5.66%	3,127	463	14.81%	3,127	818	26.20%	3,127	1,411	45.00%	3,127	1,490	47.60%
Specify	California State Preschool Program (CSPP)																	
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	1,932	9	0.47%	1,932	145	7.51%	1,932	286	14.80%	1,932	438	22.70%	1,932	633	33.00%	1,932	650	33.60%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	94	-	0.00%	94	1	1.06%	94	6	6.38%	94	12	12.80%	94	11	12.00%	94	11	11.70%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619																		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	141	6	4.26%	141	24	17.02%	141	49	34.75%	141	85	60.30%	141	193	12.00%	141	220	156.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	1,737	19	1.09%	1,737	177	10.19%	1,737	312	17.96%	1,737	646	37.20%	1,737	724	42.00%	1,737	757	43.60%
Licensed Family Child Care Homes and Licensed Center-Based Facilities not receiving CCDF funds	16,700	18	0.11%	16,700	105	0.63%	16,700	410	2.46%	16,700	907	5.40%	16,700	1,439	9.00%	16,700	1,447	8.70%

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

(B)(2)(c) Data Notes

Data Notes: Year Five Data Source: Participating California TQRIS Consortia Annual Performance Report (APR) Tables for Calendar Year 2015 reported January 2016.

Target Notes: California has met target in all categories.

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

Describe the State's progress made in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS during the reporting year and across all five years of grant.

California made significant progress in rating and monitoring over the life of the grant. In 2012, capacity for conducting ERS and CLASS assessments was minimal and required Consortia to train new assessors and anchors or contract with outside consultants with the required certifications. Because California's QRIS was developed during the grant funding period, a system for rating and monitoring, including an Implementation Guide for the Rating Matrix, were all built from the ground up since 2012. Early stages of development included forming a Rating and Monitoring workgroup to create a consistent protocol, making key decisions on points of common and local implementation of the Rating Matrix across the three common tiers, and creation of a written set of guidelines, via an Implementation Guide. The Implementation Guide addresses items such as documentation, selection of classrooms for observation, and rating frequency. Also addressed were any issues that were determined by the Consortia to be local decisions. The Guide was refined throughout the grant period and was recently fully revised to reflect California's transition from RTT-ELC to the California QRIS (CA-QRIS)

By 2014, an Assessor Management system was under development to support cross-consortia inter-rater reliability. In California's application, the high-quality plan called for the utilization of a combination of local and state oversight to best maximize expertise and resources of the local TQRIS rating and monitoring process. The Rating and Monitoring workgroup, which became the Assessor Management Workgroup, developed a document entitled RTT-ELC Assessor Management Structure to guide agreements and local decisions around roles, responsibilities, and relationships among the State Master Anchor, local Anchors, and local assessors for the ERS and CLASS tools. The Assessor Management system was implemented through a contract with First 5 California.

The Assessor Management Structure established State Master Anchors directed to:

- Certify, and annually recertify, reliability of regional ERS anchors on ERS family of tools in lieu of ERS Institute (ERSI)/authors, as needed
- Provide Observation Training to local/regional CLASS assessors and anchors on Infant, Toddler, and Pre-Kindergarten (Pre-K) CLASS tools, as needed

The State Master Anchors also created an Assessor Resource Guide/Manual to help ensure ongoing quality control through the development of ongoing reliability/calibration standards on both CLASS and ERS. As a result of the Assessor Management System, by the end of the grant, consortia reported the ability to rate and monitor sites as a key accomplishment because of their increased ERS assessment capacity. Hundreds of participants were trained and the vast majority obtained certification on all tools used for rating within the CA-QRIS.

Another significant accomplishment was the certification of all CDE/EESD Field Services Consultants on the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) tool, with plans for certification on ITERS in 2017. The CDE EESD consultants conduct ECERS assessments in state preschool programs scheduled for review in compliance with the RTT-ELC Implementation Guide, extending capacity to provide valid ERS scores.

The Assessor Management System also supported increased observer and training capacity on the CLASS family of tools statewide.

By 2016 and the end of RTT-ELC funding, QRIS in California has expanded statewide. Consortia report significantly increased capacity to conduct assessments statewide. Sixty-five percent of all counties report sufficient capacity for ERS assessment and 78 percent report sufficient capacity for conducting CLASS assessments. Overall in the area of rating and monitoring the following were a direct result of RTT-ELC funding and will continue past the life of the grant:

- The Assessor Management System will continue with State Master Anchors working to certify Regional Anchors for ongoing capacity building.
- A new contribution of Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Quality dollars will support ongoing certification of raters, coaches, and trainers via Certification Grants. Certification Grants will support the CA-QRIS by building capacity for certified trainers, observers, assessors, and coaches. Funds will be used to build regional and local capacity to implement the CA-QRIS Rating Matrix and the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Pathways.
- The Rating Matrix and CQI Pathways are under revision to improve cost effectiveness, increase the state's ability to scale and sustain the QRIS, and enhance the quality improvement aspect of the system as a whole.
- Regional Training and Technical Assistance (T&TA) Coordination Hubs were created via First 5 IMPACT (new state funding stream for QRIS) for First 5 county commissions to support regional coordination of resources and data systems and to improve local system efficiencies, specifically targeted to the areas of rating and monitoring and data management.

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

Please check all that apply – The State has made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices:

- Program and provider training
- Program and provider technical assistance
- Financial rewards or incentives
- Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates
- Increased compensation

Describe the progress made improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation based on the policies and practices above.

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

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

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

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

- Six units or 90 hours of specialized classes or training for lead teachers on working with children with special needs
- Implementation of a developmental cultural linguistic approach in lesson plans and classroom materials, provision of written development and health information in the home language of parents, and one member of the teaching team fluent in any language that represents at least 20 percent of children in the classroom
- Overall ERS score of 6 (rather than 5.5)
- Offering information on community-based resources including the Strengthening Family protective factors related to social and emotional competence of children
- National accreditation
- Additional elements at the top tier to align with existing quality programs, including F5CA's Child Signature Program or Head Start

In 2016, the State's Implementation Team continued to assist in the development of high quality benchmarks by holding quarterly Consortia Meetings, offered regional and county level trainings on the ERS. The contract for Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ), training was extended to provide training in 2016 and to support the work to develop Help Me Grow. In addition to these training offerings, program and provider TA was addressed by the State Implementation Team. Consultants completed a site visit as validation of the local work, monitor respective contracts, review quarterly expenditure reports, and offered additional TA.

In 2016, the Consortia's RTT-ELC work was recognized by the state Legislature and the Governor allotted another \$50 million dollars to counties or regions following the current model of the QRIS. This funding will ensure and sustain the current work of RTT-ELC and provide QRIS block grants to State Preschool programs rated at Tiers 4 or 5 and quality improvement supports for those not yet at Tier 4. You can find information about the CSPP QRIS Block Grant on the CDE CSPP QRIS Block Grant Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/op/cspqqriskblockgrant.asp>.

Performance Measures (B)(4)(c)(1) and (2)

In the table below, [accompanying Excel spreadsheet], 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.

Total Number of Programs Enrolled in the TQRIS	TARGETS				ACTUALS					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	475	1,173	1,664	2,466	49	475	1,042	2,232	3,881	3,862
Number of Programs in Tier 1	231	146	190	115	14	231	177	424	350	222
Number of Programs in Tier 2	50	298	371	301	2	50	237	639	649	595
Number of Programs in Tier 3	186	514	684	940	26	186	349	507	742	767
Number of Programs in Tier 4	6	175	310	828	5	6	252	592	1,284	1,467
Number of Programs in Tier 5	2	32	109	282	2	2	27	70	194	306
Number of Programs Enrolled But Not Yet Rated									662	505

Corrected from 3,278 to 3881 in final submission

In the table below, 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.

ACTUALS																		
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS																		
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5		
	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	195,909	836	0.43%	195,909	6,409	3.27%	195,909	20,357	10.39%	195,909	38,525	19.70%	195,909	65,207	33.00%	195,909	66,869	34.13%
Specify																		
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	159,664	208	0.13%	159,664	2,704	1.69%	159,664	11,564	7.24%	159,664	21,000	13.20%	159,664	33,560	21.00%	159,664	30,513	19.11%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	4,557	-	0.00%	4,557	8	0.18%	4,557	96	2.11%	4,557	531	11.70%	4,557	685	15.00%	4,557	653	14.33%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619																		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	33,521	148	0.44%	33,521	924	2.76%	33,521	778	2.32%	33,521	2,877	8.60%	33,521	7,524	22.00%	33,521	9,689	28.90%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	107,848	530	0.49%	107,848	12,033	11.16%	107,848	12,045	11.17%	107,848	46,295	42.90%	107,848	38,327	36.00%	107,848	31,289	29.01%
First 5 California Child Signature Program	127,322	191	0.15%	127,322	619	0.49%	127,322	6,390	5.02%	127,322	8,014	6.30%	127,332	18,461	15.00%	127,332	21,934	17.23%

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

Data Notes

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

Data Notes: Year Four Actuals have been updated per county reporting clarifications. Data Source: Participating California TQRIS Consortia Annual Performance Report (APR) Tables for Calendar Year 2016 reported January 2017.

Target Notes: California has met target in all categories.

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

Data Notes: Data Source: Participating California TQRIS Consortia Annual Performance Report (APR) Tables for Calendar Year 2016 reported January 2017.

Target Notes: California has met target in all categories.

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

Describe progress made during the reporting year, and across all five years of grant implementation, in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation, 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 was made by the end of the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period.

In 2016, California completed an independent evaluation and validation of the QRIS performed by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) and its partners at RAND Corporation. The study team collected data in a sample of fully rated sites, including independent observations of classroom quality, a survey of providers about their participation in quality improvement activities, and direct assessments of developmental outcomes of 3- and 4-year-old children. Given the grant period and California's QRIS development period, the evaluation began before full implementation of the QRISs had occurred. Consequently, the key findings and takeaway messages are considered tentative and will be used to guide refinement of the system and inform the next stages of QRIS expansion and evaluation.

Study highlights include the following:

- Implementation of the RTT-ELC QRIS was in an early stage at the time the study began, but significant progress was made over the course of the system's development, from 2012 to 2016.
- The dissemination of QRIS ratings has been limited, but analyses of the ratings as well as community input suggest that providing detailed quality element scores in addition to the overall rating may be beneficial to parents.
- The study provides some evidence of the validity of California's QRIS ratings, though it is too early in the system's implementation to draw many conclusions.
- Study analyses reveal high levels of participation in QI activities by program staff and point to coaching as a promising approach to improving quality.

The full report is located at the RTT-ELC Web page at

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/rt/documents/rttelcqrisevalreport.pdf>.

Study findings, policy considerations, and recommendations were presented to the California QRIS implementation team, Consortia, and the Federal monitoring team in the summer of 2016. California has used the study findings to shape QRIS direction moving forward, including consideration of potential changes to the rating matrix, refinement of rating techniques and strategies, coordination in delivery of professional development and support to programs and staff, dissemination of rating information to providers and parents, and ongoing evaluation and research planning.

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

Check the Focused Investment Areas addressed in your RTT-ELC State Plan:

- (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.
- (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.
- (C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.
- (C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.

- (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.
- (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.

- (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.
- (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

Grantee needs to 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. Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

Describe the progress made in the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation, 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 was made in these areas by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

To support early childhood teachers, CDE California Early Learning and Development System provides an integrated set of resources based on state-of-the-art information for early learning and development and best practices in early education. In August 2013, the California Early Childhood Online (CECO), a RTT-ELC project, was launched with online overviews of California's Infant-Toddler Early Learning and Development Foundations and Preschool Learning Foundations (PLF); for more information, go to the CECO Web site at <http://www.caearlychildhoodonline.org/>. There are four modules on the Infant-Toddler Foundations and Framework and nine on the Preschool Foundations and Frameworks, with a culminating/summary module. The modules provided on the CECO Web site enable early childhood practitioners to increase content knowledge and ability to provide developmentally appropriate experiences for children in their care. CECO provides access to

comprehensive resources and courses in one centralized location to meet the ever-changing needs of the early childhood field. Training module hours vary; certificates indicate completion of a domain and the amount of credit for training hours earned. CECO will continue to be funded beyond the RTT-ELC period using the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF). Many of the coaches and technical assistance providers use these modules to ensure fundamental knowledge in core areas.

All of the Consortia reported that their coaches use the RTT-ELC CQI Pathways document with the California Early Learning Foundations and Frameworks as a key resource to inform site plans and PD plans. Many also reported using the CDE CCDF QI professional development providers: the Program for Infant-Toddler Care (PITC) to provide training on the Infant-Toddler Foundations and Framework and the California Preschool Instructional Network (CPIN) to provide training on the Preschool Foundations and Frameworks. PITC and CPIN trainers are active partners in many of the Consortia. Besides providing training on California's Foundations, PITC and CPIN also provide on-site technical assistance/coaching to designated sites to support deeper understanding of the Foundations.

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

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in these areas by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

N/A

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

Children's health is promoted in California in a variety of ways. At the core of health promotion strategies are the early learning standards, the Infant-Toddler Learning and Development Foundations and the Preschool Learning Foundations. For the Preschool Learning Foundations, health is addressed in Volume 1 via the section on Social-Emotional Development. Volume 2 of the Preschool Learning Foundations addresses the domains of Physical Development, including active physical play, and

Health, which includes health habits, safety, and nutrition. The Infant-Toddler Learning Foundations include social-emotional development and personal care routines. The Foundations and accompanying Curriculum Frameworks are a core piece of California's Early Learning System and are included as part of the QRIS framework.

Over the life of California's RTT-ELC grant, the state increased access to the Foundations and Frameworks by providing local trainings throughout the state beyond those participating in RTT-ELC and through translation of the volumes into Spanish. Online modules of the Foundations and Frameworks have extended their adoption. All of these strategies have helped to broaden the reach of effective health-related practices throughout the state.

Health and development have continued to be assessed via the Rating Matrix; related professional development on health standards is accessible in a variety of ways. The Pathways have been foundational in the creation of quality improvement plans for sites participating in QRIS. The finalized Pathways includes the online Preschool Health Foundations and Framework training modules available on the CECO Web site. The CECO Web site, launched in 2013, is now well attended and visited even by those who did not participate in RTT-ELC.

The RTT-ELC funds continued to support implementation of developmental screening activities in participating counties throughout the grant period. An ASQ contract supported community of practice sessions that were offered to Regional Consortia, Mentee Counties, and Partner Agencies. Topics included the Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social-Emotional (ASQ:SE), promoting communication with families, referral pathways and protocols, and sustainability and capacity building through collaboration.

An evaluation of the TA provided showed that the participants increased their knowledge related to the priority areas, and that the delivery framework was effective at reaching a wide range of RTT-ELC Regional Consortia stakeholders. Material and information provided in the different frameworks - Advanced Training of Trainers, Individualized Technical Assistance and Community of Practice (CoP) - was very well received, with a reported increase in knowledge, skills and abilities in each of the six ASQ TA priorities by the majority of participants.

The work of the California Statewide Screening Collaborative (CSSC) continued through the end of the RTT-ELC grant with members of the California's RTT-ELC Implementation Team in attendance at all meetings held. The CSSC brings together state, local, public, and private entities that focus on California's capacity to promote and deliver effective and well-coordinated health, developmental and behavioral screenings for young children, birth to age 5. The goal is to enhance state capacity to

promote and deliver effective and well-coordinated health, developmental and behavioral screenings throughout California.

CSSC work included wrapping up the customization and dissemination of the Developmental and Behavioral Screening Guide for Early Care and Education Providers. This guide was adapted from federal materials and included resources specific to California. The CSSC also focused on cross-agency and systems work.

The achievements during the RTT-ELC grant will be sustained through ongoing system-building efforts. One example is the cross-agency collaboration at regular workgroup meetings of the State Interagency Team (SIT). The SIT workgroup is sponsored by the California Department of Public Health and focuses on the California Home Visiting Program, which incorporates screening and health care access, including mental health services, into its program design. Another is the extension of the RTT-ELC ASQ contract into a Developmental Screening Network with on-going training on screening tools and CoP support. Starting in state FY 2016–17, CCDBG funds are being used to create a regional network of R&R trainers on preventive health and safety practices.

The revision of the Rating Matrix and Pathways will continue to enhance California’s efforts toward health promotion for young children. Workgroups will examine current methods of assessing health practices and ways in which effective professional development and technical assistance can be offered to early educators. The end result should be a more refined Rating Matrix that effectively assesses quality and a more robust Pathways document that meets early learning professionals where they are at and guides them toward new skills and knowledge.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

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

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

	TARGETS				ACTUALS					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Number of Children with High Needs screened	128,707	230,000	234,600	239,292	126,184	157,008	186,429	196,644	212,500	190,443
Number of Children with High Needs Referred for Services Who Received Follow-Up/Treatment	44,201	48,621	49,593	50,584	43,433	87,836	88,713	76,749	91,516	98,017
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	1,157,902	1,175,270	1,187,022	1,198,892	1,149,408	1,149,408	1,149,408	1,149,408	1,178,000	1,069,000
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	93.20%	93.20%	94.90%	95.00%	97.00%	95.00%

Data Notes: Year 5 data included for "Number of Children with High Needs screened" and "Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow up/treatment" are actual child counts, as reported by California's TQRIS Consortia for Calendar Year 2016, Head Start/Early Head Start for FY 2015–16, First 5 California Child Signature Program for July 2016, and the Department of Developmental Services Early Start Program for 2015. Data included for "Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care" is an estimated count based on currently insured children ages zero to five under 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level who received two or more doctor visits in the previous year from the 2015 California Health Interview Survey. Data included for the count "Of these participating children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care" are estimated counts of currently insured children ages zero to five under 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level" from the 2015 California Health Interview Survey.

Target Notes: While 2016 numbers demonstrate a decline from 2015, the data included for "Number of Children with High Needs screened" continues to be significantly under-reported due to California's varied screening delivery systems and lack of a centralized data system. For these reasons, California is unable to report a true count of screenings that accurately reflects the wide array of delivery methods. To support screening data practices, California continues work with the California

Development Screening Network and the Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems grant, focused on creating a system for consistent collection of common screening data indicators across various provider types. California is also engaged in the work of Help Me Grow (HMG) to increase the number of children who are screened and receive follow-up. Currently, 24 of California's 58 counties are participating in HMG, 11 as affiliates and 19 as part of a learning community.

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

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across the five years of grant implementation. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period.

N/A

D. Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation, 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 was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

As stated in the 2014 California APR, building systems for California's dynamic early childhood workforce takes time. The QI efforts included in this report highlight activities and accomplishments in California's implementation of RTT-ELC in 2016 and are a snapshot describing the individual efforts and accomplishments of the Consortia. Significant investments have been made to support the ECE workforce at the local level. Some are short-term (a year or less) and some changes were made incrementally and will take place over a period of years. Because of California's unique design, our 2016 update to California's workforce development will be described at both the state and local level, starting with an update to California's Workforce Competencies and Early Learning and Development System, an example of how PSAs worked together to address Early Education Workforce Development—Effective Workforce Development through a Quality Framework, and an example of how the early care workforce can be supported at the local level.

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

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

An essential statewide element aimed at supporting a strong workforce is the California Early Childhood Educator Competencies (Competencies). You can find information about the Competencies on the CDE California Early Childhood Educator Competencies Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/ececomps.asp>. California's robust Competencies (initiated in 2008 and completed in 2011) are aligned with the California PLF and the California Infant- Toddler Learning and Development Foundations and guide PD and related QI activities. The Competencies serve four interrelated purposes: (1) provide structure for workforce development; (2) inform Higher Education course of study; (3) guide credentialing efforts; and (4) define educator skills, knowledge and dispositions.

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

- The Competencies Integration Project (CIP), a SAC for Early Learning project, created a rubric for mapping the Competencies to course work and PD training activities.
- Because of the breadth of these competencies, the CIP also created a web-based Mapping Tool to assist faculty and PD providers in mapping their learning objectives to specific competencies.

From when the California Competencies Mapping Tool became operational in 2014 to December of 2016, there has been an increase of 159 mapped courses that brings the total number of mapped courses to 651. In 2016, there were a total of 72 trainings that have been mapped with the Competencies via the web-based Mapping Tool. The aforementioned data, as well as data gathered by the attendees of webinars, provided by child development higher education faculty from California Community Colleges and State Universities, and state- funded PD providers demonstrates significant growth in the usage of the mapping tool.

Information on the CIP can be found on the Child Development Training Consortium (CDTC) Web page at <http://www.childdevelopment.org/cs/cip/print/htdocs/cip/home.htm>.

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

In 2016, 103 Community Colleges in California have agreed to participate in CAP. Of these colleges, 91 are officially aligned with the core eight courses, and two others are in the revision process to align their courses.

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

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

Community colleges can choose to align with any or all of these courses. Further information on the CAP can be found on the Child Development Training Consortium Web page at https://www.childdevelopment.org/cs/cdte/print/htdocs/services_cap.htm.

The Early Childhood Educator Competencies Self-Assessment Toolkit (ECE CompSAT), another SAC project, was created to be a PD self-reflection resource for the early childhood education workforce. The ECE CompSAT came online in February 2014 and has assisted RTT-ELC site leaders and coaches with the development of professional growth plans by identifying the competencies needed for effective, high-quality early education practice. Several consortia have included utilization of the ECE CompSAT into their action plans as a way to focus on the priority of local workforce needs. Since its launch, the ECE CompSAT Web site has had an average of 592,760 page views with 84,860 unique visitors per year. This traffic represents users from family child care home education networks, resource and referral programs, college faculty, as well as many international users.

As mentioned in previous APRs, California's RTT-ELC Team held IAT meetings for Consortia representatives and PSAs. As relationships between IAT participants grew, so did their work together. One of the highlights of these inter-agency relationships was F5CA's November 2016 Child Health, Education and Care Summit—Building Powerful Partnerships. This Summit was conducted in

partnership with CDE, California Health and Human Services Agency, CDPH, CDSS, CDDS, California Department of Veterans Affairs, and California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

One of the sessions focused on Power of a Workforce Registry and asked attendees to imagine an information system where California's leaders and local implementers have the data they need to truly understand who comprises the early childhood workforce, support career ladder advancement, and tailor supports to meet specific workforce improvement needs. The session noted that this data could be a powerful source of information to advocate for workforce policy and funding changes. California pioneers, from Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Santa Clara counties, have implemented California Workforce Registry as a state, regional, and local collaboration. It pointed out the power of the Registry in quality improvement efforts and how other consortia can access the Registry to track and promote the education, training, and experience of their early care and education workforce for the purpose of improving professionalism and workforce quality. State Quality Improvement Professional Development (PD) systems are being used by Consortia to support participating site QI plans. These PD programs include Child Care Initiative Project (CCIP), Program for Infant/Toddler Care (PITC), California Preschool Instructional Network (CPIN), Desired Results Training and Technical Assistance (DR T&TA), California Collaborative on the Social-Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CA CSEFEL), California Early Childhood Mentor Program (CA ECMP), and Family Child Care at its Best (FCCAIB).

First 5 Santa Barbara County has layered their RTT-ELC funding with other funding sources to continue to support the early care workforce by:

- Maintaining a professional incentive program designed to encourage early care and education professionals, including center-based child care, licensed and unlicensed family child providers to engage in on-going PD leading to advanced degrees and child development permits
- Recruiting new partners who have the skills, knowledge, resources and enthusiasm that will enhance program development

Performance Measures (D)(2)(d)(1) and (2):

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for:

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

	TARGETS				ACTUALS					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	51	102	102	102	31	51	102	102	102	102
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	20,314	20,721	21,135	21,558	19,916	20,943	22,501	21,322	20,273	18,523

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

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.

ACTUALS												
Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials,												
Type of Credential	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Assistant (Lowest)	4,372	2.00%	4,732	3.00%	4,938	3.00%	4,721	3.00%	4,386	2.00%	3,906	2.22%
Child Development Associate Teacher	6,237	4.00%	7,340	4.00%	7,490	4.00%	7,349	4.00%	6,953	4.00%	6,271	3.56%
Child Development Teacher	3,782	2.00%	4,442	2.00%	5,117	3.00%	5,691	3.00%	5,836	3.00%	5,503	3.13%
Child Development Master Teacher	999	1.00%	978	1.00%	1,098	1.00%	1,098	1.00%	967	1.00%	827	0.47%
Child Development Site Supervisor	3,501	2.00%	2,916	2.00%	3,261	2.00%	2,298	1.00%	2,044	1.00%	1,939	1.10%
Child Development Program Director (Highest)	1,025	1.00%	535	1.00%	597	0.00%	165	0.00%	87	0.00%	77	0.04%

(D)(2)(d) Data Notes

E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

The CDE developed the Desired Results Developmental Profile-School Readiness (DRDP-SR) as a Kindergarten Entry Assessment. The DRDP-SR covers the domains of language and literacy development, cognition and general knowledge (including early mathematics and early scientific development), approaches toward learning (including self-regulation), social and emotional development, and English language development. The CDE and its assessment partners, WestEd and UC Berkeley Evaluation and Assessment Research (BEAR) Center, further developed the DRDP-SR in collaboration with the State of Illinois’ RTT-ELC work. This collaboration led to the creation of the Desired Results Developmental Profile - Kindergarten (2015) (DRDP-K (2015)) which adds the domains of physical well-being and motor development (including adaptive skills), History-Social Science, Visual and Performing Arts, and Language and Literacy Development in Spanish. The instrument was

expanded with later levels of development so the assessment is appropriate for use throughout the entire kindergarten year. It was field tested in the FY 2014–15 academic year. The DRDP-K (2015) with all domains went into use in California in fall 2015. Additional data, collected during fall 2015 implementation, were needed in order to complete the calibration. The calibration analysis, which began in FY 2014–15 was finalized in spring 2016. Multidimensional Item Response Theory (IRT) was used to analyze Field Test and Calibration Study data. This approach ensures psychometric efficiency and minimizes the number of DRDP (2015) measures needed in each domain, providing strong evidence of reliability and construct validity. Additionally, the CDE collaborated with its assessment partners (UC Berkeley and WestEd) on the design of additional validity and reliability research studies to Studies for the DRDP-K that will commence in 2015, and include rater certification, inter-rater reliability, criterion zone setting (cut score), concurrent validity, and equating studies linking the current version of the DRDP-K assessment to DRDP assessments for preschool, thereby helping to build connections between early education and K-12 communities. These research activities are still underway in FY 2016–17.

Each of the Consortia continue to work with districts in their counties to support training and use of the DRDP-K for the assessment of young children within the first two months of entering Transitional Kindergarten (TK) or traditional Kindergarten (K).

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

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation, 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. Describe the State’s strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

N/A

Attach the following final documents:

- **Final Validation Study: can be found at**
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/rt/documents/rttelcqrisevalreport.pdf>
- **Kindergarten Entry Assessment Summary**

N/A

Future State plans

Thank you for filling out the Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge grant Final Progress Report. Please provide the Departments with a description of your State’s future early learning plans.

The four years of the RTT-ELC grant has set the framework for sustaining QRIS in California. In 2014, the state Legislature recognized the Consortia's RTT-ELC work and the Governor allotted \$50 million dollars annually to counties or regions following the current model of the QRIS. This funding will ensure and sustain the current work of RTT-ELC by providing QRIS block grant to CSPPs rated at Tiers 4 or 5 and quality improvement funds to raise the quality of CSPPs not yet at Tier 4. Information can be found at the CDE CSPP QRIS Block Grant Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/csppqris1415rfa.asp>.

Then in April 2015, the F5CA Commission approved \$190 million in funding over five years to support First 5 Improve and Maximize Programs so All Children Thrive (IMPACT). Currently, 48 Lead Agencies (which include all 58 counties) are participating in First 5 IMPACT. IMPACT forges partnerships between F5CA and counties to achieve the goal of helping children ages zero to five and their families thrive by increasing the number of high-quality early learning settings, including supporting and engaging families in the early learning process. Supporting more settings to achieve high-quality standards helps ensure more of California's children enter school with the skills, knowledge, and dispositions necessary to be successful. More information can be found on the F5CA IMPACT Web page at http://www.cfc.ca.gov/programs/programs_impact.html.

This commitment was followed by the involvement of the DOF and the SBE in the legislative process that resulted in the enactment of the FY 2015–17 Infant-Toddler (I/T) QRIS Block Grant (Senate Bill 97, Chapter 11, Statutes of 2015, of the FY 2015–16 Annual Budget Act, Budget Item 6100-1 194-0001, Schedule (12), Provision 17) for \$24.163 million for two years. The purpose of this I/T QRIS Block Grant was to support local QRIS consortia to provide training, TA, and resources to help infant and toddler child care providers meet a higher tier of quality as determined by their local QRIS. Plans are to extend the I/T QRIS Block Grant going forward using CCDF funds. In fall 2016, the CDE initiated on-going CA-QRIS Certification Grants to the CA-QRIS regional hubs to provide funding for their assessors and coaches to attain necessary certification of the rating tools and professional development systems.

These funding streams have formed the foundation that has spurred all of California’s counties to participate. Though coming from separate funding agencies (F5CA and CDE), both agencies have been working to support the one CA-QRIS Consortium. Both agencies have reached a memorandum of understanding regarding the common data elements to be collected and shared for joint reporting on these funds. Near plans include the CA-QRIS Consortium deciding on a CA-QRIS name, logo and tag line and launching a Website that is parent-friendly, allowing easily understood information about QRIS, county-specific information, and resources. Future plans include refining the CQI Pathways, examining the rating matrix for modifications, refining the Implementation Guide, and conducting

case study evaluations. As the local QRISs, regional hubs, and state support team work together, we hope to see greater efficiencies, while maintaining a focus on systems building.

Some pieces are firmly in place, but with F5CA IMPACT funding sunseting in 2021, California will need to explore its commitment to QRIS and whether additional funds can support this endeavor.

Budget and Expenditure Tables

Expenditure Table 1: Overall Expenditure Summary by Budget Category— . Report your actual expenditures for the entire grant period.

Budget Table1: Budget Summary by Budget Category						
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$34,797.05	\$83,673.08	\$194,875.52	\$177,903.16	\$34,116.50	\$525,365.31
2. Fringe Benefits	\$591.97	\$7,122.95	\$41,547.17	\$61,180.89	\$4,612.65	\$115,055.43
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,755.92	\$9,349.16	\$1,143.77	\$783.28	\$13,032.13
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,228.41	\$0.00	\$1,228.41
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$53.59	\$4.19	\$36.43	\$94.21
6. Contractual	\$2,286,229.32	\$3,819,831.69	\$6,147,592.81	\$2,363,794.49	\$175,219.52	\$14,792,667.83
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$296,581.11	\$89,893.13	\$26,335.71	\$19,682.06	\$432,492.01
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$2,321,618.34	\$4,208,964.75	\$6,483,311.38	\$2,631,590.62	\$234,450.44	\$15,879,935.53
10. Indirect Costs*	\$127,800.52	\$283,249.54	\$214,719.37	\$85,972.73	\$11,702.80	\$723,444.96
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$5,556,824.00	\$12,417,464.00	\$19,490,884.83	\$20,091,147.42	\$152,744.22	\$57,709,064.47
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$11,638.57	\$39,889.36	\$32,955.92	\$28,992.40	\$158,577.07	\$272,053.32
13. Total Grant Funds Expended (add lines 9-12)	\$8,017,881.43	\$16,949,567.65	\$26,221,871.50	\$22,837,703.17	\$557,474.53	\$74,584,498.28
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Expenditures (add lines 13-14)	\$8,017,881.43	\$16,949,567.65	\$26,221,871.50	\$22,837,703.17	\$557,474.53	\$74,584,498.28

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended 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 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 was expected to 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. The State could request to amend this amount if needed.

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

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

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

The three projects that expended less than budgeted were:

Project 2 – Regional Leadership Consortia, Expansion and Related Activities,

Project 12 – Evaluation, and

Project 13 – Inter Rater Reliability

Each of these projects were driven by a Consortia or contractor. In each case, they were able to complete the work for less than the anticipated amount.

Project 1 – Grants Management was also shy of the budgeted amount due to the personnel and indirect costs lines not expending as much as budgeted.

See GRADS360 for further detail.

Please provide the Departments with an estimated total of grant funds to be returned to the U.S. Treasury.

Total remaining grant funds \$414,847.64 – see GRADS360 for further detail.

Appendix:
Budget Tables

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (7/6/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$35,070.51	\$34,797.05	\$79,071.48	\$83,673.08	\$199,203.66	\$194,875.52	\$191,479.26	\$177,903.16	\$34,116.50	\$34,116.50	\$538,941.41	\$525,365.31
2. Fringe Benefits	\$508.49	\$591.97	\$7,111.23	\$7,122.95	\$41,575.40	\$41,547.17	\$61,246.66	\$61,180.89	\$4,612.65	\$4,612.65	\$115,054.43	\$115,055.63
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,755.92	\$1,755.92	\$9,043.44	\$9,349.16	\$1,139.08	\$1,143.77	\$783.28	\$783.28	\$12,721.72	\$13,032.13
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,249.65	\$1,228.41	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,249.65	\$1,228.41
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$53.59	\$53.59	\$4.87	\$4.19	\$36.43	\$36.43	\$94.89	\$94.21
6. Contractual	\$2,286,239.32	\$2,286,229.32	\$3,819,831.69	\$3,819,831.69	\$6,147,592.81	\$6,147,592.81	\$2,602,568.49	\$2,363,794.49	\$200,244.21	\$175,219.52	\$15,056,476.52	\$14,792,667.83
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$296,526.17	\$296,581.11	\$88,001.70	\$89,893.13	\$24,501.07	\$26,335.71	\$10,164.00	\$19,682.06	\$419,192.94	\$432,492.01
9. Total Direct Costs	\$2,321,818.32	\$2,321,618.34	\$4,204,296.49	\$4,208,964.75	\$6,485,470.60	\$6,483,311.38	\$2,882,189.08	\$2,631,590.62	\$249,957.07	\$234,450.44	\$16,143,731.56	\$15,879,935.53
10. Indirect Costs	\$126,711.10	\$127,800.52	\$286,614.13	\$283,249.54	\$212,444.20	\$214,719.37	\$76,403.14	\$85,972.73	\$37,904.27	\$11,702.80	\$740,076.84	\$723,444.96
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$9,850,000.00	\$5,556,824.00	\$10,150,000.00	\$12,417,464.00	\$26,024,702.00	\$19,490,884.83	\$10,352,656.62	\$20,091,147.42	\$1,465,701.38	\$152,744.22	\$57,843,060.00	\$57,709,064.47
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$12,062.77	\$11,638.57	\$39,889.36	\$39,889.36	\$32,955.92	\$32,955.92	\$28,992.40	\$28,992.40	\$158,577.07	\$158,577.07	\$272,477.52	\$272,053.32
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$12,310,592.19	\$8,017,881.43	\$14,680,799.98	\$16,949,567.65	\$32,755,572.72	\$26,221,871.50	\$13,340,241.24	\$22,837,703.17	\$1,912,139.79	\$557,474.53	\$74,999,345.92	\$74,584,498.28
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$12,310,592.19	\$8,017,881.43	\$14,680,799.98	\$16,949,567.65	\$32,755,572.72	\$26,221,871.50	\$13,340,241.24	\$22,837,703.17	\$1,912,139.79	\$557,474.53	\$74,999,345.92	\$74,584,498.28

Grantee Drawdowns

Drawdown Totals	\$6,880,111.88	\$11,126,551.67	\$21,939,292.30	\$22,817,127.26	\$10,468,738.96
-----------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Grantee Drawdowns last updated: July 9, 2017

Comments

Adjusted numbers to reflect expenditures through life of the grant.

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Grants Management

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$35,070.51	\$34,797.05	\$59,450.08	\$64,051.68	\$193,175.37	\$188,847.23	\$183,509.88	\$169,933.78	\$34,116.50	\$34,116.50	\$505,322.34	\$491,746.24
2. Fringe Benefits	\$508.49	\$591.97	\$967.62	\$979.34	\$39,685.80	\$39,657.57	\$58,507.54	\$58,441.77	\$4,612.65	\$4,612.65	\$104,282.10	\$104,283.30
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,755.92	\$1,755.92	\$9,043.44	\$9,349.16	\$1,139.08	\$1,143.77	\$783.28	\$783.28	\$12,721.72	\$13,032.13
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,249.65	\$1,228.41	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,249.65	\$1,228.41
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$53.59	\$53.59	\$4.87	\$4.19	\$36.43	\$36.43	\$94.89	\$94.21
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,846.42	\$2,846.42	\$2,961.00	\$2,961.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,807.42	\$5,807.42
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,889.85	\$4,944.79	\$28,051.70	\$29,943.13	\$24,501.07	\$26,335.71	\$10,164.00	\$19,682.06	\$67,606.62	\$80,905.69
9. Total Direct Costs	\$35,579.00	\$35,389.02	\$67,063.47	\$71,731.73	\$272,856.32	\$270,697.10	\$271,873.09	\$260,048.63	\$49,712.86	\$59,230.92	\$697,084.74	\$697,097.40
10. Indirect Costs	\$7,310.39	\$8,399.81	\$19,330.81	\$15,966.22	\$78,928.14	\$81,203.31	\$61,574.70	\$71,144.29	\$37,904.27	\$11,702.80	\$205,048.31	\$188,416.43
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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$12,062.77	\$11,638.57	\$39,889.36	\$39,889.36	\$32,955.92	\$32,955.92	\$28,992.40	\$28,992.40	\$158,577.07	\$158,577.07	\$272,477.52	\$272,053.32
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$54,952.16	\$55,427.40	\$126,283.64	\$127,587.31	\$384,740.38	\$384,856.33	\$362,440.19	\$360,185.32	\$246,194.20	\$229,510.79	\$1,174,610.57	\$1,157,567.15
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$54,952.16	\$55,427.40	\$126,283.64	\$127,587.31	\$384,740.38	\$384,856.33	\$362,440.19	\$360,185.32	\$246,194.20	\$229,510.79	\$1,174,610.57	\$1,157,567.15

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Regional Leadership Consortia, Expansion and Related Activities

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals		
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$249,460.00	\$249,460.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$249,460.00	\$249,460.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$249,460.00	\$249,460.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$249,460.00	\$249,460.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$9,850,000.00	\$5,556,824.00	\$10,150,000.00	\$12,417,464.00	\$26,024,702.00	\$19,490,884.83	\$10,352,656.62	\$20,091,147.42	\$1,465,701.38	\$152,744.22	\$57,843,060.00	\$57,709,064.47	
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$9,850,000.00	\$5,556,824.00	\$10,150,000.00	\$12,417,464.00	\$26,274,162.00	\$19,740,344.83	\$10,352,656.62	\$20,091,147.42	\$1,465,701.38	\$152,744.22	\$58,092,520.00	\$57,958,524.47	
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$9,850,000.00	\$5,556,824.00	\$10,150,000.00	\$12,417,464.00	\$26,274,162.00	\$19,740,344.83	\$10,352,656.62	\$20,091,147.42	\$1,465,701.38	\$152,744.22	\$58,092,520.00	\$57,958,524.47	

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Home Visiting

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$407,711.44	\$407,701.44	\$183,469.28	\$183,469.28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$591,180.72	\$591,170.72
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$407,711.44	\$407,701.44	\$183,469.28	\$183,469.28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$591,180.72	\$591,170.72
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$407,711.44	\$407,701.44	\$183,469.28	\$183,469.28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$591,180.72	\$591,170.72
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$407,711.44	\$407,701.44	\$183,469.28	\$183,469.28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$591,180.72	\$591,170.72

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Screening Tool Distribution

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals		
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$25,679.99	\$25,679.99	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$198,065.40	\$198,065.40	\$56,934.50	\$56,934.50	\$34,763.04	\$34,763.04	\$315,442.93	\$315,442.93	\$315,442.93
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$291,636.32	\$291,636.32	\$59,950.00	\$59,950.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$351,586.32	\$351,586.32	\$351,586.32
9. Total Direct Costs	\$25,679.99	\$25,679.99	\$291,636.32	\$291,636.32	\$258,015.40	\$258,015.40	\$56,934.50	\$56,934.50	\$34,763.04	\$34,763.04	\$667,029.25	\$667,029.25	\$667,029.25
10. Indirect Costs	\$5,955.35	\$5,955.35	\$61,243.63	\$61,243.63	\$72,028.68	\$72,028.68	\$12,354.79	\$12,354.79	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$151,582.45	\$151,582.45	\$151,582.45
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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$31,635.34	\$31,635.34	\$352,879.95	\$352,879.95	\$330,044.08	\$330,044.08	\$69,289.29	\$69,289.29	\$34,763.04	\$34,763.04	\$818,611.70	\$818,611.70	\$818,611.70
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$31,635.34	\$31,635.34	\$352,879.95	\$352,879.95	\$330,044.08	\$330,044.08	\$69,289.29	\$69,289.29	\$34,763.04	\$34,763.04	\$818,611.70	\$818,611.70	\$818,611.70

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Curricula Development for Higher Education

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals		
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$170,000.00	\$170,000.00	\$224,542.00	\$224,542.00	\$226,840.00	\$226,840.00	\$128,618.00	\$128,618.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$170,000.00	\$170,000.00	\$224,542.00	\$224,542.00	\$226,840.00	\$226,840.00	\$128,618.00	\$128,618.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$170,000.00	\$170,000.00	\$224,542.00	\$224,542.00	\$226,840.00	\$226,840.00	\$128,618.00	\$128,618.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$170,000.00	\$170,000.00	\$224,542.00	\$224,542.00	\$226,840.00	\$226,840.00	\$128,618.00	\$128,618.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

CSEFEL

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$835,458.13	\$835,458.13	\$974,308.31	\$974,308.31	\$900,057.41	\$900,057.41	\$501,956.82	\$501,956.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,211,780.67	\$3,211,780.67
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$835,458.13	\$835,458.13	\$974,308.31	\$974,308.31	\$900,057.41	\$900,057.41	\$501,956.82	\$501,956.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,211,780.67	\$3,211,780.67
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$835,458.13	\$835,458.13	\$974,308.31	\$974,308.31	\$900,057.41	\$900,057.41	\$501,956.82	\$501,956.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,211,780.67	\$3,211,780.67
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$835,458.13	\$835,458.13	\$974,308.31	\$974,308.31	\$900,057.41	\$900,057.41	\$501,956.82	\$501,956.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,211,780.67	\$3,211,780.67

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Licensing Website

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals		
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$900,000.00	\$900,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$900,000.00	\$900,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$900,000.00	\$900,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$900,000.00	\$900,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Linking KEA Data to CALPADS

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,621.40	\$19,621.40	\$6,028.29	\$6,028.29	\$7,969.38	\$7,969.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$33,619.07	\$33,619.07
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,143.61	\$6,143.61	\$1,889.60	\$1,889.60	\$2,739.12	\$2,739.12	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,772.33	\$10,772.33
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$387,296.00	\$387,296.00	\$252,259.00	\$252,259.00	\$177,837.00	\$177,837.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$817,392.00	\$817,392.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$413,061.01	\$413,061.01	\$260,176.89	\$260,176.89	\$188,545.50	\$188,545.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$861,783.40	\$861,783.40
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$93,039.69	\$93,039.69	\$1,789.43	\$1,789.43	\$2,473.65	\$2,473.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$97,302.77	\$97,302.77
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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$506,100.70	\$506,100.70	\$261,966.32	\$261,966.32	\$191,019.15	\$191,019.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$959,086.17	\$959,086.17
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$506,100.70	\$506,100.70	\$261,966.32	\$261,966.32	\$191,019.15	\$191,019.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$959,086.17	\$959,086.17

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

PAS/BAS Training for Mentors

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals		
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$21,458.00	\$21,458.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21,458.00	\$21,458.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$21,458.00	\$21,458.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21,458.00	\$21,458.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$21,458.00	\$21,458.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21,458.00	\$21,458.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$21,458.00	\$21,458.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21,458.00	\$21,458.00

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Electronic Training Materials on Existing Content

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals		
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$540,215.76	\$540,215.76	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$147,119.34	\$147,119.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$787,335.10	\$787,335.10	\$787,335.10
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$540,215.76	\$540,215.76	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$147,119.34	\$147,119.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$787,335.10	\$787,335.10	\$787,335.10
10. Indirect Costs	\$113,445.36	\$113,445.36	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$113,445.36	\$113,445.36	\$113,445.36
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$653,661.12	\$653,661.12	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$147,119.34	\$147,119.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$900,780.46	\$900,780.46	\$900,780.46
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$653,661.12	\$653,661.12	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$147,119.34	\$147,119.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$900,780.46	\$900,780.46	\$900,780.46

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Professional Development for Early Start

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals		
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$285,716.00	\$285,716.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$142,856.00	\$142,856.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$285,716.00	\$285,716.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$142,856.00	\$142,856.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$285,716.00	\$285,716.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$142,856.00	\$142,856.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$285,716.00	\$285,716.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$285,714.00	\$142,856.00	\$142,856.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Evaluation

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals	
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,701,387.26	\$1,701,387.26	\$2,592,936.40	\$2,592,936.40	\$578,001.72	\$392,920.09	\$13,723.44	\$0.00	\$4,886,048.82	\$4,687,243.75
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,701,387.26	\$1,701,387.26	\$2,592,936.40	\$2,592,936.40	\$578,001.72	\$392,920.09	\$13,723.44	\$0.00	\$4,886,048.82	\$4,687,243.75
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$113,000.00	\$113,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$113,000.00	\$113,000.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,814,387.26	\$1,814,387.26	\$2,592,936.40	\$2,592,936.40	\$578,001.72	\$392,920.09	\$13,723.44	\$0.00	\$4,999,048.82	\$4,800,243.75
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,814,387.26	\$1,814,387.26	\$2,592,936.40	\$2,592,936.40	\$578,001.72	\$392,920.09	\$13,723.44	\$0.00	\$4,999,048.82	\$4,800,243.75

Budget Export Report

2012 - California - SEA

PR Award #: S412A120003

Award Amount: \$75,000,000.00

Budget Version: Revision (4/3/2017)

Effective Date: 7/6/2017

Status: Approved

Inter Rater Reliability

Categories	Year 1: 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012		Year 2: 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013		Year 3: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2014		Year 4: 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015		Year 5: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016		Totals		
	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	Budgeted	Actual	
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,114.84	\$13,114.84	\$489,414.18	\$489,414.18	\$766,284.11	\$712,591.74	\$151,757.73	\$140,456.48	\$1,420,570.86	\$1,355,577.24	\$1,355,577.24
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,114.84	\$13,114.84	\$489,414.18	\$489,414.18	\$766,284.11	\$712,591.74	\$151,757.73	\$140,456.48	\$1,420,570.86	\$1,355,577.24	\$1,355,577.24
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$59,697.95	\$59,697.95	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$59,697.95	\$59,697.95	\$59,697.95
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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,114.84	\$13,114.84	\$549,112.13	\$549,112.13	\$766,284.11	\$712,591.74	\$151,757.73	\$140,456.48	\$1,480,268.81	\$1,415,275.19	\$1,415,275.19
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,114.84	\$13,114.84	\$549,112.13	\$549,112.13	\$766,284.11	\$712,591.74	\$151,757.73	\$140,456.48	\$1,480,268.81	\$1,415,275.19	\$1,415,275.19