

Early Learning Challenge

2016 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



JUNE 2017





**Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge
Annual Performance Report
CFDA Number: 84.412**

Georgia

2016

Due: February 28, 2017

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0713
Expiration Date: October 31, 2019

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0713. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0713. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, DC 20202-6200.



Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

B(1) Developing and Adopting a Common, Statewide TQRIS

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

B(3) Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs

B(4) Promoting Access to High-Quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

D(1) Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and 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) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A130039

2. Grantee Name Office of the Governor, State of Georgia

3. Grantee Address 203 State Capitol
City: Atlanta
State: Georgia Zip: 30334

4. Project Director Name: Kristin Bernhard
Title: Deputy Commissioner for System Reform

Phone #: (404) 463-6089 Ext.: _____ Fax #: (770) 357-4874

Email: kristin.bernhard@dec.al.ga.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? Yes No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? Yes No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:

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

Approving Federal agency: ED HHS Other Specify other: _____

(Submit current indirect cost rate agreement with this report.)

Executive Summary

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

Georgia's third year of implementation of its Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant continued to demonstrate the investments that the state has made in early education and how grant funds have been used for purposeful early learning system building. Examples include the expansion of initiatives related to Georgia's child care subsidy program that increase access to high-quality opportunities for families and additional training and professional development opportunities for teachers and program leaders. The state continued community building and family engagement opportunities in the four Early Education Empowerment Zones, successfully implemented a Kindergarten Readiness Check in all of Georgia's school districts, and expanded materials and trainings related to the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards. The state rated more than 300 new programs in its tiered quality rating and improvement system, Quality Rated. Finally, the state's use of data and research was demonstrated by the functionality of Georgia's early childhood integrated data system and full implementation of data collection for the Quality Rated validation study.

In 2016, the lead agency for the grant, the Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL) continued efforts to align RTT-ELC initiatives with many of the state's other early learning programs with a concerted focus on sustainability. All of the state's accomplishments were aligned with Georgia's 2016 -2018 Child Care and Development Fund state plan and critical early learning programs, such as Georgia's Pre-K Program, DECAL's Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership grant, and child care licensing. In terms of sustainability, the state was awarded grants for infant-toddler technical assistance, for two-generation initiatives, and for evaluation planning for the Child Care and Development Fund. These efforts demonstrates the state's commitment and capacity to continuing the system-building work undertaken with Race the Top - Early Learning Challenge.

While DECAL serves as the lead agency for the Early Learning Challenge, the state's success is due to the continued collaboration with other state agencies and stakeholders. The exponential increase in Quality Rated participation is partially attributable to the partnerships between the state and philanthropic organizations that raise money for bonus packages and communication plans. Additionally, the strong partnership between DECAL and Great Start Georgia (the state's home visiting model) is evidenced in the incorporation of home visiting into child care centers. Georgia's Annual Performance Report is organized in the five themes outlined in the grant. The following details the state's successes in each of those key areas:

Building Successful State Systems

- **Governance Structure** - The governance structure for the grant remained the same. DECAL is the lead agency for the grant. DECAL houses the state's child care licensing system, Georgia's Pre-K program, the Head Start State Collaboration Office, and Quality Rated. DECAL also oversees the child care subsidy program and the Child and Adult Care Food Program. DECAL is also an Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership grantee. Within DECAL, grant activities are coordinated through the System Reform division. In addition to DECAL, several Georgia organizations provide governance support. Georgia's RTT-ELC governance structure includes an implementation team composed of key staff members from participating state agencies who are responsible for successfully implementing the 12 projects in Georgia's RTT-ELC grant. This cross-agency implementation team, known as the Project Leads Team, met monthly throughout Year Three to review progress on the state's scope of work, troubleshoot any challenges, and ensure collaboration across grant projects.
- **Early Education Empowerment Zones** - In Year Three, the state continued the successful implementation of the four Early Education Empowerment Zones. In each of the four zones, "Birth-to-Eight Teams" of local stakeholders continued to meet regularly. The Birth-to-Eight Teams oversaw the rollout of key professional development, technical assistance, family engagement, and child care subsidy initiatives in their regions. DECAL also partnered with the Georgia Department of Community Affairs to design and award the Child Care Expansion Grant to encourage the establishment of new high-quality early learning programs in the zones. In 2016, community-building efforts in the zones demonstrated the impact of purposeful stakeholder engagement. The percentage of programs participating in Quality Rated and the percentage of subsidy certificates being utilized in two- and three-star programs, the highest tiers in the state's TQRIS, surpassed state averages.

- ***Governor's Education Reform Commission and Additional Early Learning Investments*** - In 2015, the Governor created an Education Reform Commission, which included an Early Education Subcommittee charged with making recommendations that would increase access to high quality. Governor Deal's FY2017 budget supported recommendations made by the commission to include significant additional investments in early learning, most notably \$36.4 million in additional lottery funding for Georgia's Pre-K Program. In October 2016, DECAL also increased the tiered reimbursement rate paid to Quality Rated child care providers who serve children participating in the state's child care subsidy program. Tiered reimbursement rates were raised to 5% for one-star Quality Rated providers, 10% for two-star Quality Rated providers, and 25% for three-star Quality Rated providers.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

- ***Increasing the Number of Higher Quality Programs*** - The state continued, for the second year in a row, the trend of rating over 300 new programs in a single year. In 2016, an additional 325 programs were rated and 104 already rated programs were rerated. At the time of the state's RTT-ELC application in 2013, approximately 230 programs had been rated, and by the end of 2016 that number had risen to 1,207. This is a 435% increase. DECAL also implemented a successful marketing strategy that was statewide but targeted to families of young children. The marketing campaign significantly increased website traffic.
- ***Transition to the ECERS-3 and ITERS-3*** - In Year Three, the state successfully transitioned to the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale - Third Edition (ECERS-3). All child care center preschool programs are now rated using the ECERS-3. The state also concluded data collection for an ECERS-3 validation study funded by the Institute of Education Sciences, with results expected in the spring of 2017. The state began efforts to transition to the ITERS-3, with implementation expected in 2017.
- ***Quality Rated Validation*** - The state continued the formal validation process. This includes continuing analyses of Quality Rated data to inform policy and practice. In 2016, Child Trends and Georgia State University concluded the pilot year and began the family child care home portion of the validation study.

Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children

- ***Expanding the Use of the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS)*** - In 2016, DECAL expanded efforts to support stakeholders and early educators in utilizing the GELDS. Specifically, DECAL developed a high-quality online planning tool and continued to conduct in-depth, in-person trainings throughout the state. Additionally, DECAL launched the Planning Educational Activities for Children (PEACH) website. The website makes available to teachers thousands of high-quality activities linked to the GELDS. The state also continued its partnership with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) to incorporate early English language standards into the GELDS. This partnership continued in 2016 with additional training institutes on how to use the framework.
- ***Convening a Comprehensive Assessment Task Force*** - In Year Three, Georgia concluded the state's comprehensive assessment task force. The final report will be available in early 2017. Additionally, the state provided professional development on assessment to early learning providers, and continued with plans to implement the Survey of Wellbeing of Young Children (SWYC) to implement developmental screening.
- ***Creating Additional Family Engagement Opportunities*** - Georgia continued to make progress on engaging and supporting families. Efforts included two grant opportunities. One grant targeted family connection collaboratives and facilitated 21 grantees offering families supports through transportation, development and distribution of literacy brochures, and attending school and community activities. The second grant was targeted to the four Early Education Empowerment Zones and the Metro Atlanta area. The five selected grantees offered families in their communities a wide variety of innovative opportunities including mindfulness training, family field trips, meal cooking classes, physical fitness, and child abuse awareness and prevention. The state also continued the process of implementing the Great Start Georgia framework and evidence-based home visiting in the empowerment zones. This unique program offers home visiting services through partnerships with child care centers. Since the formal launch in 2015, 291 families have been enrolled in home visiting programs and 2,713 home visits were completed.

Great Early Education Workforce

- ***Supporting Early Educators*** - The state continued offering financial incentives for early educators obtaining initial and higher credentials. This program supported the awarding of over 430 credentials, with the majority of participants earning either a Child Development Associate credential or a technical college certificate. Building on previous years' efforts, the state continued to build competencies for the top two levels of the Georgia Professional Development Hierarchy. This training includes a coaching project with the University of Florida that provides formal professional learning community facilitator certification. Finally, the state began the process for designing and implementing a statewide coaching designation system.
- ***Revising the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework*** - In Year Three, the state made gains in revising the state's workforce knowledge and competency framework and aligning the framework with national standards. Beginning in the summer of 2016, DECAL convened a work group to revise the state's workforce knowledge and competency framework. Georgia submitted these revised competencies to national experts for review in September of 2016. The revised competencies were reviewed by representatives from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and found to be in alignment with NAEYC Professional Preparation Standards. Additional work needed to be completed around competencies related to professionals working with children with disabilities. In Year Four, DECAL will complete the revision and rollout of the state's workforce knowledge and competency framework and build additional professional development opportunities in alignment with the postsecondary system.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

- ***Developing a Kindergarten Readiness Assessment*** - The state made considerable progress in the development of a kindergarten readiness assessment. The assessment is now referred to as the Kindergarten Readiness Check. The first iteration was piloted in Georgia's Pre-K classrooms in the spring of 2015, a second iteration was piloted in kindergarten in the fall of 2015, and a third iteration was piloted in Georgia's Pre-K classrooms in the spring of 2016. A statewide rollout was successfully completed in the fall 2016. One school in each of Georgia's 181 school districts participated. Results are currently being analyzed. Full statewide rollout is expected in the fall of 2017. Additionally, the Georgia Department of Education began efforts to revise its full, year-long kindergarten assessment.
- ***Creating the Cross-Agency Child Data System (CACDS)*** - In 2016, the state made significant progress in enhancing CACDS, Georgia's early childhood integrated data system, and completed the buildout of foundational elements. Work was accomplished through partnerships with the Department of Public Health, Department of Human Services, the Department of Education, the Governor's Office of Student Achievement, and Head Start and Early Head Start grantees. CACDS now incorporates U.S. Postal Service data and has made substantial progress in linking screening and referral data, foster care, and home visitation data. The state has plans to incorporate data from TANF and SNAP. Additionally, the state launched the Georgia Professional Development System, which consolidates the Professional Development Registry and Training Registration Systems into one web application.

Lessons Learned and Strategies Going Forward

In Year Three, the state made significant progress in meeting many of the Early Learning Challenge goals. The number of rated programs has greatly increased, and numerous supports are available for early educators in terms of GELDS activities and professional development. With RTT-ELC funds, the state's home visiting program has been successfully expanded, and data systems have been improved and expanded. In short, due to the state's RTT-ELC efforts, children and families have increased access to high-quality early learning.

The state also made great strides in project alignment and integration. This was done by establishing better communication between the Early Learning Challenge funded projects as well as to the general public and stakeholders. These efforts will continue to improve throughout 2017.

While the state has been successful in recruiting programs for Quality Rated, the "early adopters" and "high flyers" have now been recruited. Therefore, in Year Four, the state will expand efforts to recruit licensed providers and those that serve large numbers of children and families receiving subsidies. The state will continue

its successful marketing campaign. Additionally, the state will continue to examine the methodology for estimating the early childhood education workforce and will continue research to better understand the impact of CCDF policies and the decline in the number of early education programs.

In Year Three, state leaders continued planning for the sustainability of RTT-ELC funded work and added strategies for sustainability across all RTT-ELC funded projects. Embedding sustainability strategies will continue into subsequent grant years. Additionally, going forward into Year Four of the RTT-ELC implementation, Georgia will continue the system-level approach that has led to successful implementation thus far. Specific system-level strategies include a continued focus on communication about quality, alignment of all early education programs, and the importance of child care programs becoming rated in the state's tiered quality rating and improvement system. The structures that Georgia has in place for the Early Learning Challenge will continue to serve the state in Year Four.

Successful State Systems

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

Governance Structure

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

Governance and administrative and fiscal oversight of Georgia's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant is grounded in Bright from the Start: Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL). In addition to the RTT-ELC grant, DECAL administers major federal and state programs, including Georgia's Pre-K Program, the Head Start State Collaboration Office, Quality Rated (Georgia's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System), child care licensing, the Child Care Development Fund child care subsidy program, the Child and Adult Care Food Program, the Summer Food Service Program, and state Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grant.

Kristin Bernhard, Deputy Commissioner for System Reform at DECAL, continues to serve as grant manager for Georgia's RTT-ELC award. Other leadership and key staffing positions have remained constant throughout Year Three.

Georgia's Key Governance Stakeholders:

The Georgia Children's Cabinet, chaired by Georgia's First Lady Sandra Deal, is composed of the heads of all state agencies that serve the needs of Georgia's children from birth to age 18 and of select community, philanthropic, education, and business stakeholders. The Cabinet also serves as Georgia's State Advisory Council. During Year Three of the grant, RTT-ELC project leads provided the Cabinet with formal updates on the implementation of the Georgia's grant. This provided an opportunity for the state's leaders on child policy to provide input on grant implementation.

The Commissioner of DECAL also sits on the Alliance of Education Agency Heads (AEAH), composed of the heads of all education departments in the state. The other members of the Alliance include the Chancellor of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, State School Superintendent, President of the Georgia Student Finance Commission, Commissioner of the Technical College System of Georgia, Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Student Achievement, Executive Secretary of the Professional Standards Commission, and the Governor's Education Policy Advisor. The Alliance also received updates on the status of RTT-ELC implementation throughout Year Three.

Part of Georgia's RTT-ELC governance structure also includes an Implementation Team, composed of key staff members from Participating State Agencies responsible for successfully implementing the 12 projects in Georgia's RTT-ELC grant. This cross-agency implementation team, known as the "Project Leads Team," met monthly throughout Year Three to review progress on the state's scope of work, troubleshoot any challenges, and ensure collaboration across grant projects.

Over the third year of the RTT-ELC grant, Georgia focused on deepening stakeholder engagement at all levels, increasing public awareness to support grant implementation, and implementing sustainability strategies.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

In Georgia, numerous advocacy groups, professional associations, philanthropies, state agencies, elected officials, and others support young children and their families. Keeping them all informed of and engaged in the state's early learning system reform is a focus of Georgia's RTT-ELC efforts. In addition to establishing diverse communication strategies and the efforts of a full-time communications specialist to dispense information about Georgia's RTT-ELC implementation, in Year Three DECAL also convened several stakeholder groups to provide feedback and guidance on implementing specific RTT-ELC projects. More than just opportunities for the state to share information to affected stakeholders, these groups provided a meaningful avenue for diverse stakeholders to actually shape the development of the state's RTT-ELC work. A particular strength in Georgia's stakeholder engagement efforts around RTT-ELC was in the state's Early Education Empowerment Zones.

Stakeholder Involvement in the Early Education Empowerment Zones

Stakeholder involvement has been the cornerstone of Georgia's Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs). As written into Georgia's RTT-ELC application, the E3Zs were designed to be communities home to 10,000 children living in conditions of high need, where the state would then use grant strategies to provide additional funding and supports. In Year One, Georgia selected the E3Zs using a two-phase collaborative process with community partners. In Year Two, full-time community coordinators were in place in each E3Z to facilitate the work.

In Year Three, the E3Z community coordinators steadily built relationships and rapport with influential community stakeholders in each zone. The community coordinators were also trained in research methods and facilitation practices critical to their job duties, such as the Professional Learning Community (PLC) Facilitator Training program offered through a partnership with the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, described in more detail later in this report. PLC techniques have proved to be very valuable in the facilitation of local Birth to Eight Team meetings.

Monthly Birth to Eight Team meetings have been held in the Bibb County Zone, Clarke County Zone, and in the South Georgia Zone throughout 2016. Bimonthly Birth to Eight Team meetings have been held in North Georgia throughout 2016. Two of these teams, in North Georgia and South Georgia, are new collaborative groups resulting from the implementation of the Early Learning Challenge Grant. These groups have been regularly meeting for almost two years now. Participation among Birth to Eight Team members is continually assessed across early childhood fields of work, including: Family Support; Early Learning; Advocacy; Health, Mental Health, and Nutrition; and Special Needs and Intervention. Attendance of DECAL Child Care Services, Inclusion, Pre-K, and Quality Rated staff from local communities has added an additional layer of support to Birth to Eight groups. Staff from the Child Care Resource and Referral (CCRR) agencies that cover each E3Z provide updates on Quality Rated participation status in each Birth to Eight meeting. The Birth-Eight teams have been powerful ways to generate support among community leadership for the state's TQRIS.

Georgia is intentionally measuring and evaluating the impact of the stakeholder engagement in the Early Education Empowerment Zones through the use of an Implementation Science Framework. In March 2016, key E3Z staff were trained by the National Implementation Research Network on the Implementation Science Framework. The Governor's Office of Student Achievement (GOSA) is the evaluator of the E3Z project, and the E3Z community coordinators contribute monthly reports to support GOSA evaluation efforts. A total of four regular evaluations which utilize the Implementation Science Framework have been publicly posted (<http://gosa.georgia.gov/race-top-early-learning-challenge-grant-evaluation>), and the state plans to continue to post biannual evaluations until the completion of the Georgia's RTT-ELC grant.

Stakeholder Involvement Across Other Grant Projects

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

the RTT-ELC projects:

- External Quality Rated Validation Team
- Quality Rated Advisory Committee
- Quality Rated Policy Committee
- Workforce Knowledge and Competency Task Force
- Kindergarten Entry Assessment Development Teams of Pre-K and Kindergarten Teachers
- Comprehensive Assessment Task Force
- Cross Agency Child Data System Leadership Committee

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

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

Governor Deal's FY2017 budget signed in Year Three included significant additional investment in early learning, most notably \$36.4 million in additional lottery funding for Georgia's Pre-K Program. The budget supported recommendations made by the Education Reform Commission in 2015 to increase Pre-K lead teacher and assistant teacher salaries and to provide additional funding for operating and benefit costs. These additional funds, awarded to teachers in both public and private settings based on post-secondary credential and years of experience, directly support the state's RTT-ELC goals around retaining a highly qualified early childhood workforce.

In October 2016, DECAL also increased the tiered reimbursement rate paid to Quality Rated child care providers who serve children participating in the state's child care subsidy program, known as Childcare and Parent Services (CAPS). Tiered reimbursement rates were raised to 5% for one star Quality Rated providers, 10% for two star Quality Rated providers, and 25% for three star Quality Rated providers. This increase in the tiered reimbursement rate directly supports the state's RTT-ELC goal to serve more children with high-needs in the highest quality early learning programs.

Participating State Agencies

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

Overall, there have been no significant changes in participation by or commitment of any of the Participating State Agencies as proposed in Georgia's RTT-ELC grant.

This page is intentionally blank due to formatting issues

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

During this reporting year of RTT-ELC implementation, has the State made progress in **developing or revising** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards?

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- State-funded preschool programs
- Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
 - Center-based
 - Family Child Care

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- Early Learning and Development Standards
- A Comprehensive Assessment System
- Early Childhood Educator Qualifications
- Family Engagement Strategies
- Health Promotion Practices
- Effective Data Practices

The State has made progress in ensuring that (please check all that apply):

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

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

Quality Rated, Georgia's tiered quality rating and improvement system, was launched in 2012. In 2016, Georgia's TQRIS continued to be a catalyst for increasing access to quality and to serve as the framework of quality for all of the state's early learning programs and initiatives. Under Quality Rated, eligible programs receive a rating based on a portfolio score that measures structural quality and an observation score that measures process quality. Both the portfolio and the observations are based on program standards that reflect current research on best early learning practice and policy.

In 2016, Year Three of Georgia's RTT-ELC grant, the state continued to build on and make progress in using Quality Rated to assess, improve, and communicate the quality of the state's early learning programs. While most of the substantive changes to the rating process were made in Years One and Two, the state expanded and enhanced efforts to assess, improve, and communicate quality during Year Three. These efforts included rolling out an extensive marketing campaign that increased awareness of Quality Rated while communicating to families and the public the importance of high-quality early learning. The state also expanded the Quality Rated assessment team, started a peer support network for providers, and implemented the inclusion endorsement that began in 2015. The state also aligned Quality Rated with the state's other early learning initiatives under a common quality improvement and assessment framework.

The following describes efforts started, expanded, or completed in Year Three to develop and revise Quality Rated.

Assessment

In Year Three, Georgia's assessment team expanded to 17 assessors and five portfolio reviewers. Additionally, there are four positions dedicated to providing support on assessment and observation report writing. The increased positions and dedicated support staff have helped streamline the rating process and reduced the time it takes for programs to be rated once they are ready for their observation.

The state also successfully transitioned to the use of the ECERS-3. Now all programs that are in the process of being rated receive an observation using the ECERS-3. As part of the state's validation efforts, the state is measuring the impact of the transition. The state also completed work on an Institute of Education Sciences grant validating the ECERS-3 instrument.

Finally, the state completed a Quality Rated pilot for Georgia's Pre-K programs operated by local education agencies. Ten programs completed the Quality Rated process and received a star rating. The participants valued the process, especially the efforts related to quality improvement. Based on the results of this pilot, the state is looking at different ways of aligning Georgia's Pre-K and Quality Rated technical assistance and professional development.

Improvement

In Year Three, the state expanded and increased efforts in quality improvement. The state launched a Quality Rated Peer Support Network that serves as the next step for programs that have completed resource and referral technical assistance. Participating programs receive training credit hours. There are currently seven Peer Support Networks across the state. In terms of resource and referral technical assistance, the state's technical assistance coordinator continued to facilitate communication and information exchange and to assist in developing results-driven training and technical assistance practices among the state's resource and referral agencies.

In 2015, the state began a process where Quality Rated programs can receive an "inclusion" designation. To receive the designation, rated programs have to score at a certain level on the Inclusive Classroom Profile.

Technical assistance is provided through one of DECAL's inclusion coordinators. In Year Three, five programs earned the endorsement and eight programs are currently in the technical assistance process.

In addition to the state's revision and expansion efforts around assessment and improvement, the state made considerable progress in Year Three with aligning Quality Rated with the state's other education quality processes. This included completing a cross-walk of all assessment, improvement, and communication efforts between programs. This facilitated a better targeting of resources and a strong public messaging process. For example, Georgia's Pre-K programs housed in a local education agency facility already receive a rating under the state's College and Career Ready Performance Index and receive technical assistance from Georgia's Pre-K consultants. To require programs to receive a different rating would be redundant and require resources that are better targeted to other early learning programs. In Year Four, state leaders will share the cross-walk and incorporate this framework approach to all early learning programs.

In summary, Georgia's efforts at revising the TQRIS in Year Three focused on expanding efforts in assessment, improvement, and alignment. The state made considerable progress on all three that will improve the quality of early education for the state's youngest learners. These efforts will be continued in Year Four as the state continues to solidify the progress made in raising quality since receiving the RTC-ELC grant.

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

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

In Year Three of RTT-ELC, the state has continued to make significant progress in Quality Rated recruitment efforts. In 2016, the state directed recruitment efforts to licensed child care and specifically to those programs that serve children and families receiving child care subsidies. Recruitment efforts for Quality Rated are channeled primarily through the state's resource and referral system, although all DECAL program consultants (licensing, Georgia's Pre-K, and infant/toddler) have access to information about Quality Rated and have been trained on recruiting providers. DECAL also works with external stakeholder and advocacy groups to communicate the importance of Quality Rated. These efforts, along with the extensive marketing campaign that began in spring 2016, continue to increase awareness of Quality Rated.

As noted in Table (B)(4)(c)(1), the state ended the year with 2,849 programs participating in Quality Rated. This is an increase of 406 programs from the previous year. It is a total increase of 1,723 programs from Georgia's 2013 RTT-ELC baseline.

The recruitment efforts toward licensed child care are demonstrating success. At the end of 2016, 56% of licensed programs were participating in Quality Rated. For center-based care, 65% of licensed programs are participating, compared to 44% of family child care homes. In terms of children and families receiving child care subsidies, 74% of all subsidy certificates were going to programs participating in Quality Rated. The community-based recruitment efforts being undertaken in the four Early Education Empowerment Zones were notably successful. In those four zones, 88% of subsidy certificates were going to participating programs.

These results are a direct result of the state's efforts in targeting licensed centers and those programs serving children and families receiving subsidies. Rather than direct resources towards programs such as Georgia's Pre-K classes operated by local education agencies, the state made a concerted effort to direct

recruitment efforts to those programs with a greater need for additional resources and supports. By continuing to focus on licensed child care, the state is able to increase access to high quality. This also includes classrooms that have been found to have lower quality, specifically those serving infants and toddlers.

In Year Three, the state officially launched a Quality Rated marketing campaign. The campaign was led with a kick-off event at the Atlanta Baby and Child Expo and continued with 1,600 public service announcements across a variety of media, including radio, television, social media, and print outlets. Since the campaign kick-off, visits to the Quality Rated website have increased to approximately 20,000 per month. The public service announcements have been well received and have reached a geographically broad but demographically targeted audience. While the target of this campaign is parents and families shopping for child care, it has also put positive pressure on the early learning provider community to participate in the TQRIS.

In addition to the marketing campaign, the state has continued with the Quality Rated Advisory Committee. This committee, made up of child care providers and early childhood stakeholders, offers guidance on policy and program improvements. Members serve as Quality Rated ambassadors across the state. Members are selected through an application process and serve for twelve months. The number of applicants in 2016 exceeded expectations.

The state will continue existing strategies to ensure measurable progress is being made. This includes continued recruitment activities utilizing the state's licensing consultants and resource and referral agencies. As discussed in the next section, the state has also increased tiered reimbursement rates that will encourage more providers serving children and families receiving subsidies to participate. The state is also expanding the number of subsidy grants offered to early education programs. These subsidy grants offer a higher reimbursement amount but also require meeting higher standards of quality and participating in Quality Rated. In 2016, DECAL also applied for additional Early Head Start - Child Care Partnership slots. To receive these slots, child care learning centers and family child care homes have to achieve a rating within a specified amount of time. Finally, the state has adopted a goal for all providers who participate in Georgia's subsidy program to participate in Quality Rated by 2020. This achievable goal will provide incentives for programs to begin the process of being rated during the grant period.

Year Four will continue with a similar focus. The marketing campaign is being expanded and resource and referral agencies are continuing their recruitment efforts. Additionally, the state is working to identify what specific community efforts in the empowerment zones have "moved the needle" and will begin expanding and increasing those efforts statewide. Georgia has also set a goal for all subsidy dollars to be directed toward Quality Rated programs. This, along with additional state investments and alignment of other programs, will continue Georgia's successful recruitment efforts.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.										
Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	433	23.9%	452	25%	905	50%	1,357	85%	1,809	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	48	14.1%	85	25%	171	50%	256	75%	324	95%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	86	20%	216	50%	308	70%	350	81.2%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	775	23.5%	825	25%	1,649	50%	2,474	75%	3,298	100%
Other 1										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.										

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows

Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	1,809	433	23.9%	1,816	598	32.9%	1,838	741	40.3%	1,867	830	44%			
<i>Specify:</i>	Georgia's Pre-K Program														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	341	48	14.1%	325	151	46.5%	354	201	56.7%	351	244	69.5%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	431	0	0%	999	17	1.7%	1,001	34	3.4%	1,003	34	3.4%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	3,298	775	23.5%	3,825	1,242	32.5%	3,411	1,610	47.2%	3,492	1,931	55.3%			
Other 1															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows

Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
Other 4															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

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

State-funded preschool: Statewide and Quality Rated participating Georgia's Pre-K program counts are actual (2016-2017 Georgia's Pre-K program data, December 2016).

Early Head Start and Head Start: Number of programs in the state is actual, from the Head Start Centers Locations Datasets as of December 2016 (<http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/data/center-data>) deduplicated by site and grantee. Number of programs in Quality Rated is actual as of the end of 2016 to the best of our knowledge; however, Early Head Start and Head Start site data do not match perfectly to Georgia's early learning provider data, and some assumptions have to be made regarding a program's Head Start status.

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

IDEA, Part B, section 619: In the 2016-2017 school year, Georgia's Pre-K programs are using IDEA Part B, section 619 funding to place a special education teacher in 155 inclusion classrooms statewide, and 34 of these are in Quality Rated participating programs; these counts are actual (Georgia's Pre-K program data, December 2016). The Georgia Department of Education reports 1,003 schools use Part B, section 619 funding for preschool special education (October 2016 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System [FTE 2017-1]). Based on information later received from the Georgia Department of Education, a more accurate baseline count is that there were 984 schools with preschool special education services in October 2013 (FTE 2014-1), not 431 as originally reported.

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

CCDF: Actual count of programs participating in Quality Rated out of total programs that received a CCDF subsidy payment for services to children in November or December of 2016 (Maximus data system, 2/3/2017).

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

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

State-funded preschool: The main reason for not meeting this target is the state is in the process of determining the best way to rate Georgia's Pre-K programs located in public schools. In 2016, DECAL implemented and completed a pilot for Georgia's Pre-K programs located in public schools. The pilot demonstrated the importance of quality improvement technical assistance while also supporting the need for ensuring that resources are targeted to programs with the greatest needs.

Georgia's Pre-K programs receive a significant amount of ongoing support, and those who are housed in public schools are also included in the Georgia College and Career Ready Performance Index, which assigns a score to public schools and school districts. The state is formalizing the process for incorporating and aligning other supports and rating systems into Georgia's TQRIS.

IDEA, Part B: The main reason for not meeting this target is the state is in the process of incorporating other supports and rating systems into Georgia's TQRIS. Similar to Georgia's Pre-K classrooms in public schools, these classrooms are included in the Georgia College and Career Ready Performance Index.

CCDF: The state is closer to this target. As part of Georgia's 2016-2018 CCDF State Plan, tiered reimbursement rates were significantly increased beginning in October 2016. It is expected that the increased rates will be an incentive for more programs receiving CCDF to enroll and to pursue higher star levels. Additionally, DECAL has set a goal for all programs receiving subsidy funds to be required to participate in Quality Rated by the end of 2020.

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

The State has made progress in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that (please check all that apply):

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

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

Georgia has a robust system for rating and monitoring the quality of programs participating in Quality Rated. The rating process includes submitting a portfolio related to five structural quality standards and undergoing an independent observation using one or more of the Environment Rating Scale family of instruments. Through an extensive training process, all assessors are trained to reliability and undergo regular inter-rater reliability checks. After a program has been rated, the monitoring process includes an annual "check-in" renewal for two years followed by a new rating every three years. Quality Rated child care programs may also request a reassessment before the three-year required renewal if they wish to attempt to increase their rating level.

Quality Rated observation visits are coupled with additional monitoring visits from child care licensing consultants (at least twice a year for licensed child care centers and family child care homes) and visits, if appropriate, from consultants representing Georgia's Pre-K Program and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.

In terms of rating programs, the state made substantial progress in Year Three. At the time of the state's Early Learning Challenge application, approximately 230 programs had been rated. This accounted for 3.5% of all eligible programs. At the end of 2016, 1,207 programs had been rated, an increase of 425% in three years. The current number does not include the approximately 120 programs that have completed the rating process but did not score high enough to achieve a one-, two-, or three-star rating. In addition to the work of rating new programs, there were 104 programs that were rerated in 2016.

DECAL's success in rating programs is also evident in the percent of subsidy certificates in rated programs, especially in the Early Education Empowerment Zones. In these areas, the state piloted additional incentives to support providers receiving subsidies and to support families in selecting higher quality programs. Statewide, the percent of subsidy certificates utilized in 1-3 star rated programs is 28%. In the empowerment zones it is 47%, with two of the four zones over 50%. In terms of 2-3 star rated programs, the statewide average is 14% and in the empowerment zones it is 30%. These successes demonstrate Georgia's commitment to increase access to high quality for children and families receiving subsidies and the impact that the state's investment in rating programs is making.

In summary, Georgia has implemented a strong process for measuring quality in child care programs. This process includes portfolio submission followed by an independent, on-site observation. This process has

exponentially increased the number of programs rated and increased access to high quality for all families, especially those receiving subsidies. In 2017, the state will continue these efforts while expanding the strategies that have proven successful in the state's Early Education Empowerment Zones.

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

Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices? (If yes, please check all that apply.)

- 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 in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Similar to previous years, Georgia focused its RTT-ELC investments on improving quality in training and technical assistance and financial incentives. Additionally, the state invested additional supports for programs beginning the re-rating process. This includes efforts to track programs increasing a star level or remaining at the highest levels. It is important to note that the creation of Quality Rated, Georgia's tiered quality rating and improvement system, was based on the work of a large stakeholder committee that identified high standards for early education in the state and a research study that measured programs' ability to meet those previously identified standards across a representative sample. Therefore, those standards at the highest level (three stars) are those that state experts deemed as important and were shown to be both ambitious and achievable for providers.

Distribution of Rated Programs

In Georgia's RTT-ELC application, the state forecasted the percentage of child care programs that would be rated at each star level. Specifically, the state provided estimates based on the breakdown at the time of the application (38% one star, 35% two stars, and 27% three stars), with a projected increase in the percentage of one-star programs and a decrease of two- and three-star programs, assuming that higher quality programs were earlier adopters and based on percentages found in the 2009 statewide representative study of quality. The following table details the breakdown at the time of the application, the forecasted percentages for each grant year, and the actual percentages as of the end of each year. It is important to note that the breakdowns combine both child care learning centers and family child care homes.

The chart that follows compare the progress the state has made. The columns of data, left to right, represent: The Star Rating; the Baseline as it was written in the state's RTT-ELC Application 2013; the amount Forecasted 2014; Actual 12/31/14; the amount Forecasted for 2015; the Actual: 12/31/15; Forecasted for 2016; Actual, 12/31/16

1 Star	38%	46%	25%	44%	33%	43%	38%
2 Star	35%	42%	46%	40%	47%	41%	47%
3 Star	27%	11%	29%	15%	19%	17%	15%

As the chart demonstrates, rating distributions are moving closer to the level of initial estimates (though those estimates may have overestimated the number of one-star programs and underestimated the number of two- and three-star programs.). In Year Three, the percentage of one-star programs has continued to increase while the percentage of three-star programs has continued to decrease. Considering that the state rated many more programs in 2016 and that the early adopters were of higher quality, this movement is to be expected.

As detailed in the subsequent section, Quality Rated validation efforts are designed to better understand

the reasons for the distribution.

Efforts to Improve Quality

In an effort to assist programs in achieving higher levels of quality, the state has implemented several distinct but interrelated activities. All of these activities were expanded in Year Three.

- 1. Training and Technical Assistance** - The state continues to offer providers extensive training and technical assistance to assist in improving quality. Most training around Quality Rated is conducted by Georgia's six resource and referral agencies (R&Rs). In Year Three, DECAL hired an RTT-ELC funded position specifically to work with the R&Rs to ensure that training is consistent across the state. The state also provided the R&Rs training on the ECERS-3. This will help the R&Rs in preparing child care programs for the transition to the ECERS-3 while improving the quality of those classrooms.
- 2. Financial Incentives** - The state expanded the use of financial incentives for programs to improve quality using both CCDF and RTT-ELC funds. While tiered reimbursement had been instituted in 2013 with CCDF funds, the number of programs participating increased in Year Three, in large part because of the RTT-ELC investments in training and technical assistance to help providers achieve and maintain higher quality levels. This expansion is expected to increase in Year Four since the state substantially increased the tiered percentages offered to rated programs effective October 1, 2016. In addition to offering tiered reimbursement, the state expanded the RTT-ELC funded Quality Rated Subsidy Grants in Year Three.

In summary, Quality Rated is the mechanism by which the state monitors quality improvement and offers financial support to providers to raise quality. The monitoring includes tracking the percentage of programs receiving a one-, two-, or three-star rating and noting the number of programs who increase their star level. In terms of support, the state offers programs training and technical assistance through the resource and referral system and DECAL consultants as well as an increasing number of meaningful financial incentives and innovative payment practices for child care subsidy.

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

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	1,126	1,755	2,734	4,262	6,642
Number of programs in Tier 1	88	388	793	1,402	1,993
Number of programs in Tier 2	80	353	722	1,346	2,657
Number of programs in Tier 3	62	94	274	544	996
Number of programs in Tier 4					
Number of programs in Tier 5					
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated	896	920	945	970	996

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	1,126	1,779	2,443	2,849	
Number of programs in Tier 1	88	106	298	460	
Number of programs in Tier 2	80	195	417	570	
Number of programs in Tier 3	62	123	167	177	
Number of programs in Tier 4					
Number of programs in Tier 5					
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated	896	1,355	1,561	1,642	

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

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

Count of Quality Rated participants and their rating levels as of December 31, 2016, from Quality Rated data system. Since these data are maintained in the TQRIS data system (e.g., a program is not at tier 3 until it is assigned that level within the data system), no further data collection methodology is required other than retrieving the data from the data system. In addition to star-rated programs in the three tiers reported above, 123 programs were to be rated in the first quarter of 2017, 119 programs had gone through the rating process but failed to earn a star level, and 1,400 participating programs were in varying stages of the process to prepare for a rating, for a total of 1,642 additional participating programs who are enrolled but not yet rated. The 119 programs that went through the rating process but failed to earn a star rating are currently engaged in specialized technical assistance to assist them in earning a rating in the coming year.

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

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

The state's target for 2016 was 4,262 participating child care programs. The current number is 1,413 fewer than originally anticipated. The 2016 target was based on 2013 provider population numbers. Since 2013, Georgia, like other states, has seen a decrease in the number of eligible programs. The number of licensed child care centers and family child care homes has been steadily decreasing in recent years. Georgia's 2015 Economic Impact Study found that while the state has seen a decrease in the number of programs, the average number of children being served in a child care facility has been increasing. In other words, fewer programs are serving more children per program. DECAL is currently conducting additional research to better understand the reduction in early education programs.

It is also important to note that the original target included the full universe of early education programs such as Georgia's Pre-K programs operated by local education agencies and programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619. As discussed in the section, Georgia specifically targeted recruitment efforts toward licensed programs and programs serving children and families receiving subsidies.

The number of rated programs also falls short of the application target of 3,292 rated programs at the end of Year Three. Several similar reasons explain why the state did not meet these targets. First, the process for programs to be rated is taking, on average, longer than 12 months. Therefore many programs recruited at the end of 2014 and through 2015 were not ready to complete the process. Second, one of Quality Rated's foundational principles is that programs determine when they submit their portfolio, and there is no time limit within which programs must submit. Many programs have elected not to submit until they are confident they will be rated at two or three stars. While part of DECAL's message has been that just being rated signifies to families a commitment to quality, many programs are still hesitant to submit. Third, the number of programs that have gone through the process but have not scored high enough to receive a rating has increased. This is expected considering that many of the state's higher quality programs were more likely to join Quality Rated in the beginning. This trend is supported by data measuring the percentage of programs at each level during different time periods. The percentage of ratings at the three-star level was greater during the first year and a half of Quality Rated.

Many of the state's recruitment efforts are going as planned. The resource and referral agencies will continue to recruit in 2017. Efforts to recruit family child care providers improved in 2016, and DECAL will continue to work with each of the state's resource and referral agencies to ensure that they are employing adequate resources dedicated to recruiting family child care. In terms of rating programs, the state has rated over 780 new programs in the last two years. This does not include reratings and those programs that did not achieve a 1, 2, or 3 star rating. One obstacle in meeting the targets has been getting those programs that are participating but have not been rated to submit their portfolio. The state is working with the resource and referral agencies to specifically target these programs in 2017.

Finally, it is important to note that the state is also in the process of better aligning early education programs operated by local education agencies to the state's College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) that assigns ratings to public schools. This alignment, when finalized, will increase the rates of programs participating in a Georgia quality rating and

improvement system.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Definition of Highest Tiers

For purposes of Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2), how is the State defining its "highest tiers"?

“Highest tiers” in Georgia's tiered quality rating and improvement system means Quality Rated programs with 2 or 3 stars.

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

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.										
Targets: Number and percent 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 One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	1,800	3.6%	5,050	10%	10,099	20%	17,674	35%	25,248	50%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	520	2%	2,540	10%	5,079	20%	8,880	35%	12,698	50%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	1,236	2%	6,086	10%	12,172	20%	21,300	35%	30,429	50%
Other 1										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows

Targets: Number and percent 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 One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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.

In most States, the **Number of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State** for the current reporting year will correspond to the **Total** reported in Table (A)(1)-3a. If not, please explain the reason in the data notes.

Actuals: Number and percent 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 One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	50,496	1,800	3.6%	46,227	3,454	7.5%	46,198	5,252	11.4%	45,042	7,162	15.9%			
<i>Specify:</i>	Georgia's Pre-K Program														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	25,396	520	2%	23,682	2,671	11.3%	24,541	6,603	26.9%	26,146	10,081	38.56%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	7,519			8,185			9,213			8,301					
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	8,974			9,481			9,752			10,380					
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	60,858	1,236	2%	61,278	4,075	6.7%	55,674	6,179	11.1%	58,397	8,768	15.01%			
Other 1															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows

Actuals: Number and percent 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 One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four			
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 4															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

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

State-funded preschool: Georgia's Pre-K is a universal program, not targeted to special populations, and does not collect child income data nor home language data. The total number of children with high needs in Georgia's Pre-K is an estimate based on counting all enrolled children who were marked as having an IEP, having limited English proficiency, or participating in a means-tested benefit, as reported by grantee programs to the state (2016-2017 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2016). This count, while actual, is only approximate to the definition of children with high needs. By this method, it is estimated that 56% of all Georgia's Pre-K students are children with high needs. PeachCare, Georgia's Child Health Insurance Program, was removed from the means-tested benefit data collected by Georgia's Pre-K beginning in the 2013-2014 school year because it was decided that its relatively higher income threshold (235% of the federal poverty level at the time, and since increased to 247% of the federal poverty level) did not best identify children from low-income families. As a result, the highest possible benefit eligibility that was counted for Georgia's Pre-K students dropped from 235% of the federal poverty level to 185% for students in school systems (free and reduced lunch) and 149% for students in private programs (Medicaid). This explains why the number of children with high needs served in Georgia's Pre-K appears to have dropped from the baseline.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Total served in the state is actual count of funded enrollment (Program Information Report, 2016). Children in top tiers of quality is an estimate based on the funded enrollment of apparent Head Start and Early Head Start programs with two or three stars at the end of 2016. Some assumptions have to be made matching Head Start sites to Quality Rated and licensing data, such as whether programs with a similar, but not identical, name or address in the Head Start Program Information Report and in Quality Rated program data are indeed the same program. The statewide funded enrollment reported here does not correspond to the total in Table (A)(1)-3a because funded enrollment is not available by age; therefore, cumulative enrollment is reported there.

IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619: Georgia did not submit (B)(4)(c)(2) performance measures for Part B or C on our original ELC application in 2013, with the following explanation: "Federal law prohibits IDEA Parts C and B funded programs from sharing information about children receiving services. Families are encouraged to share this information with their early learning and development programs but cannot be required to do so. Thus Georgia is unable to track participation in Quality Rated programs by children with IEPs and IFSPs." The numbers reported in the actuals chart is the total number served statewide by Part B, Section 619, and Part C. Neither the actuals chart nor the targets chart reports numbers in top tiers of the TQRIS. The state has aggregate counts for how many children are served in IDEA statewide, but we are not able to identify these children within specific early learning programs. Part C statewide count is from December 1, 2016, federal data count. Part B, section 619 statewide count is from October 2016 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System.

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

CCDF: Numerator is number of children served in providers receiving a CCDF payment in November 2016 who were rated at 2- or 3-stars by the end of 2016; December child counts are lower due to time of year, whereas November counts are more typical. Denominator is average monthly served in calendar year 2016 (Maximus data system, 2/3/2017). The total is higher than in Table (A)(1)-3a because there were, on average, 20,291 children over the age of 5 served per month with CCDF funds. These are included here.

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

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

State-funded preschool: The main reason for not meeting this target is the state is in the process of determining the best way to rate Georgia's Pre-K programs located in public schools. In 2016, DECAL implemented and completed a pilot for Georgia's Pre-K programs located in public schools. The pilot demonstrated the importance of quality improvement technical assistance while also supporting the need for ensuring that resources are targeted to programs with the greatest needs. Georgia's Pre-K programs receive a significant amount of ongoing support, and those who are housed in public schools are also included in the Georgia College and Career Ready Performance Index, which assigns a score to public schools and school districts. The state is formalizing the process for incorporating and aligning other supports and rating systems into

Georgia's TQRIS.

CCDF: The increase in tiered reimbursement rates (effective October 1, 2016) should provide incentives for programs receiving CCDF funds to become at higher star levels. DECAL is also providing additional supports to help programs in raising their quality. The requirement for all programs receiving subsidy funds to participate in Quality Rated by the end of 2020 will also provide incentives. In 2017, the state is targeting programs serving a large number of children receiving subsidies for supports and recruitment efforts. In the four Early Education Empowerment Zones, the state has made significant progress in meeting these targets. Those efforts will be expanded in 2017.

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

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

Since the development of Quality Rated, validation has been integrated into its day-to-day management and has become an integral part of its success. Over Year Three, Georgia continued to make significant progress on its Quality Rated validation efforts. This progress includes: 1) further and more substantive analysis of Quality Rated and related administrative data; 2) continuing to engage in research-to-policy feedback loops; and 3) full implementation of the family child care home portion of the external validation study. The external validation study, conducted by Child Trends and Georgia State University, is being used to gauge the extent to which Quality Rated star levels correlate to other measures of quality and their relationship to children's growth and development. In addition to the implementation of the family child care portion, the researchers concluded the "pilot" year of the validation study and began planning for the child care center portion that will begin in the fall of 2017.

Research Methods and Analyses

Over the course of Year Three, DECAL engaged in a variety of methods and analyses in the validation process. The purpose of these activities is to inform, on an ongoing basis, Quality Rated policy and practice. These activities include:

- Using the key validation questions developed in the previous year as a timeline and roadmap for ongoing analyses. This roadmap facilitates research-to-policy feedback loops and creates a systematic process for ongoing analysis of data.
- Continuing to conduct statistical analyses related to star-level distribution and participation rates. These analyses are revised and rerun as new data become available. Analyses have grown especially robust as more programs concluded the initial rating process or began the process of being rerated. Many analyses are conducted as a joint effort between DECAL and Child Trends. New analyses included measuring the relationship between process quality, structural quality, and final ratings, examining the degree to which items in the portfolio are related to one another, and determining the length of time it takes for programs to move through the rating process.
- Using the child care resource and referral performance measures developed in previous years to meet Quality Rated goals.
- Aligning validation activities with other state early learning projects. For example, analyses related to access are being used in designing several activities in the Early Education Empowerment Zones.
- In addition to the above activities, DECAL completed a pilot study on incorporating Georgia Pre-K's classrooms operated by local education agencies into Quality Rated. The pilot study included 10 providers who completed the full Quality Rated process along with other activities. These activities included increased technical assistance and monthly cohort meetings. The providers found the process beneficial and were proud of their accomplishments. While providers found the extra technical assistance and special cohort meetings beneficial, those resources are not typical and will be difficult to sustain and scale systemically. DECAL is in the process of incorporating the results into current Georgia's Pre-K

improvement efforts.

Incorporation of Validation into Day-to-Day Activities

As part of the ongoing validation efforts, DECAL continued to hold biweekly meetings with internal staff and quarterly external meetings with key stakeholders and researchers. During Year Three, both sets of meetings met according to schedule.

The *internal* Quality Rated validation team designs and reviews ongoing validation research and shares results with the Quality Rated Policy Committee (a separate group of DECAL leadership that reviews all Quality Rated policies - see Section B(1)). The internal validation team consists of RTT-ELC management, including DECAL's Deputy Commissioner for System Reform, the director of and key policy analysts from DECAL's research and policy analysis unit, the evaluator from the Governor's Office of Student Achievement, Quality Rated's management team, and representatives from DECAL's information technology unit. The internal validation team will continue to meet biweekly throughout the grant period.

The *external* Quality Rated validation team reviews the ongoing validation work and makes recommendations in a larger policy context. This team consists of representatives from other state agencies, managers from each RTT-ELC project, and researchers from various university, philanthropic, and advocacy groups. The external validation team will continue to meet quarterly throughout the grant period.

Both validation teams help facilitate feedback loops between research, policy, and practice. For example, the internal team conducted analyses related to the potential impact of transitioning to the ECERS-3. The findings and conclusions from these analyses were presented to the Quality Rated Policy Committee for recommendations for the transition.

External Research Study

In Year Three, DECAL continued the contracted work with Child Trends to conduct a study of the effectiveness of Quality Rated. As part of the contract, Child Trends 1) assists DECAL in analyzing administrative data related to Quality Rated and 2) conducts a study that compares ratings to other measures of quality and to child outcomes. Child Trends has contracted with Georgia State University to assist with data collection.

As mentioned previously, Child Trends is assisting DECAL with its ongoing analysis of Quality Rated administrative data. In previous years, Child Trends worked with DECAL to develop a list of ongoing validation questions and a timeline related to how often each question will be answered and an analysis strategy for examining the data. This list of questions provides an ongoing timeline and roadmap for analysis.

Child Trends and Georgia State University are leading the external validation study. The study will look at how Quality Rated levels compare to other measures of quality and their relationship to child outcomes. The study will include different types of programs (e.g., child care centers and family child care homes) and different age groups (infants, toddlers, and preschool).

The first year of the external study, which began in August 2015, was a pilot to prepare for the larger validation study. The pilot study, which continued through the spring of 2016, determined the feasibility of gathering child attendance and enrollment data and tested a measure of the language and literacy richness of the environment. The pilot study also determined the best way to collect CLASS data in family child care homes, given that family child care homes often serve multiple age groups, and tested teacher and provider-reported measures of social and language skills of infants and toddlers. Based on the pilot, decisions were made to use the Toddler CLASS tool in family child care homes, to use the LENA language device to collect language samples in the homes, and to use the LENA Snapshot and the MacArthur-Bates Child Development Inventory (CDI) to gather information from teachers and providers about the early language skills of infants and toddlers.

In Year Three, Child Trends began recruitment of family child care homes participating in Quality Rated in order to 1) collect information about teacher-child interactions using the Toddler CLASS and about the language environment using the LENA and 2) collect information about the social and pre-academic skills of children attending family child care homes that are participating in QR in order to test the extent to which ratings are related to children's development and learning. The study is ongoing. Initial data collection took place in the fall of 2016 and will continue throughout the spring of 2017. The participation rate for the family child care sample was 111 out of 332 eligible sites (33%) and the parental consent rate within the 111 sites was 73%.

In summary, Georgia strengthened its validation mechanisms in Year Three. Activities included engaging in

research related to Quality Rated using a variety of methods and statistical analyses, biweekly and quarterly validation meetings, and implementing a study to validate the star levels with other measures of quality and compare ratings to child outcomes. In Year Four, the state will continue these validation activities.

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

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

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

The State has made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards (check all that apply):

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

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

Throughout Year Three of the RTT-ELC grant period, Georgia enlisted a variety of strategies to promote use of the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS). For those stakeholders who needed support to implement the GELDS, DECAL both developed a new, high-quality online lesson planning tool, as well as conducted in depth, in-person training on the standards. In Year Three, DECAL also sought to ensure that teachers were equipped to support the needs of dual-language learners (DLLs) and provided additional training opportunities meeting the needs of DLLs.

Support for the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards

In August of 2016, DECAL launched the Planning Educational Activities for Children (PEACH) website. PEACH (www.peach.dec.al.ga.gov) is an interactive website that allows teachers of children birth to five to plan lessons using the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS). The website, designed in partnership with Best Practices Institute at Georgia State University, puts thousands of high-quality, developmentally appropriate activities at teachers' fingertips. The activities available are designed for children ranging in age from birth to five years old and are directly linked to the GELDS. Additionally, teachers can use PEACH to create lesson plans, mixing activities from PEACH and other resources to ensure that every child's developmental needs are met.

DECAL and child care resource and referral field staff have received training in PEACH, including how to support teachers in using the site. DECAL also included PEACH in the Georgia's Pre-K teacher training for the 2016 - 2017 school year and is currently developing a Q&A webinar series for further PEACH training.

In Year Three, the state also conducted focus groups to gather feedback from teachers regarding what worked and what could be improved on PEACH. Participants included teachers in Family Child Care Learning Homes, Child Care Learning Centers, and Head Start/Early Head Start programs. Development plans for Phase II of PEACH have been created, using information from focus groups and will be launched in Year Four.

In Year Three, DECAL continued to provide support for teachers using the GELDS through trainings and other resources. In Year Three, the state saw the continued pay off of earlier investments of "train the trainer" courses on the GELDS. Throughout 2016, trainers who had earlier participated in a "train the trainer" course offered four GELDS trainings across the state:

- Standards 101: How to Use the GELDS
- Standards 102: Child Development
- Standards 103: Developmentally Appropriate Practice,
- Standards 104: Lesson Planning Using the GELDS

In addition, based on feedback and need from the field, an additional training, Standards 104: Lesson Planning

with the GELDS for Family Providers, was created in Year Three.

GELDS Training, Number of Sessions, Number of Participants

Standards 101: How to Use the GELDS, 38, 756

Standards 102: Child Development, 43, 603

Standards 103: Developmentally Appropriate Practice, 39, 855

Standards 104: Lesson Planning Using the GELDS 35, 783

TOTAL 155 Training Sessions, 2997 Participants

The resources created in earlier years of Georgia' RTT-ELC grant continue to be popular. Providers, and family members continue to order GELDS resources from the GELDS eStore. For example, 4,423 GELDS Teacher Tool Boxes were ordered in 2016. The GELDS materials are free of cost; those ordering only pay shipping and handling.

Support for Teachers of Dual Language Learners

In Year One, Georgia partnered with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium to incorporate the Early English Language (E-ELD) standards into the GELDS to provide a developmentally sound framework for supporting, instructing, and assessing dual language learners (DLLs), ages 2.5-5.5 years.

In Year Two, the state offered two WIDA Master Cadre trainings, which were an opportunity for stakeholders to learn about WIDA's Early English Language Development Standards Framework and how to use these standards to support, instruct, and assess young DLLs (ages 2.5 to 5.5 years) in early education programs. In Year Three, the state continued the second offering of the WIDA Master Cadre, with 43 participants completing the training across two cohorts. Participants were expected to provide training to child care providers and practitioners throughout the state after completing the master cadre.

In addition, DECAL partnered with the University of Wisconsin trainers to offer institutes on how to use the WIDA Early English Language Development Standards Framework (E-ELDS) from March- May of 2016. This training opportunity attracted 45 participants in two cohorts. Participants received a document demonstrating correspondence between E-ELDS and GELDS, and the document was posted on the DECAL and WIDA websites to ensure early learning professionals across the state had access to the resource.

Going forward into Year Four, DECAL has extended its partnership with University of Wisconsin to create a training series designed to ensure DECAL field staff are knowledgeable and aware of how to support providers in working with DLLs. Training on these topics will occur in the summer of 2017. These trainings will include both webinars and face-to-face meetings and focus on WIDA's Promising Practices, a series of guidelines for supporting dual language development through standards-based curriculum, care, instruction, and assessment.

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

The State has made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to (check all that apply):

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

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

In Year Three of the Early Learning Challenge Grant, Georgia concluded the state's comprehensive assessment task force, provided professional development on assessment to early learning providers, and continued to with plans to implement Survey for the Wellbeing of Young Children (SWYC) to implement developmental screening.

Comprehensive Assessment Task Force

In the first year of the grant, the state established a Comprehensive Assessment Task Force to identify opportunities to align and improve Georgia's current assessment practices and recommend changes to policy and practice related to child-level assessments in Georgia's early care and learning settings. The Task Force concluded its work in May 2016. Over a nearly two-year period, the Task Force, composed of experts from many sectors of the early childhood system, functioned in two subcommittees, one focused on developmental screening and the other on formative assessments.

Following a review of current practice in Georgia and in other states, the Task Force agreed on the following recommendations to inform statewide policy, coordinate child assessment efforts, and support effective professional development over the next five to ten years.

1. Identify, promote and encourage the use of evidence-based resources and guidelines to help stakeholders across the state select developmental and behavioral screening instruments and formative assessment tools.
2. Actively facilitate the inclusion and engagement of families in screening and assessment processes.
3. Develop and support a streamlined and integrated process that promotes appropriate sharing of screening and assessment results and information to link children to needed services and supports.
4. Promote coordinated and ongoing opportunities for professional learning and development that: a) focus on training administrators of developmental screening tools to ensure quality implementation and use of data to support child and family outcomes; and (b) support early educators in understanding and using formative assessment tools.

In Year Four, Georgia will pursue identifying leads to coordinate follow up activities related to each recommendation focus area and engaging department, agency and organizational leaders to catalyze implementation; identifying appropriate resources to create and promote the use of Georgia specific resources, engage families and ensure quality professional development; and developing a communications plan to disseminate these recommendations and to increase stakeholder understanding of the value of a comprehensive assessment system.

Provide Professional Development on Assessment

In Year Three, Georgia expanded the professional development opportunities available to early childhood

educators on assessment, focusing on the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's free professional development module "Watch Me! Celebrating Milestones and Sharing Concerns." DECAL made progress on developing a five-session training series designed to reinforce and expand on the concepts in the "Watch Me!" modules, as well as a companion webinar, "Acting Early in Georgia," which will provide specific information on obtaining developmental screening for children in Georgia. The state also identified, customized and printed materials promoting developmental monitoring and screening such as posters, magnets, and brochures and developed a plan for distribution of these materials and training opportunities with state and local community partners.

In Year Four, the "Acting Early in Georgia" webinar will become available, and the state will begin implementing the resource distribution and training plan. DECAL's Infant toddler specialists will begin offering the training series through in-person delivery opportunities in March 2017.

Implement Developmental Screening

In Georgia's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant application, the state proposed a pilot administering the Survey of Wellbeing of Young Children (SWYC), a new, freely-available, comprehensive screening instrument for children under 5 years of age. The SWYC was written to be simple to answer, to require 15 minutes or less to complete, and straightforward to score and interpret. However, delays in SWYC validation and development of supporting SWYC training materials from the instrument's authors has led to delays in implementing the instrument. However, in Year Three, the SWYC training manual was released and the state developed a plan for conducting screening with the SWYC in Early Head Start/Child Care Partnership sites.

In Year Four, the state will continue to review the SWYC manual and develop and train DECAL staff. In June 2017, the state plans to deliver training to Early Head Start/Child Care Partnership site staff.

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

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

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

***GEORGIA DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREAS C(3) IN THEIR RTT-ELC APPLICATION
PAGES 42 of 105 AND 43 of 105 HAVE BEEN DELETED***

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

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

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

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

Georgia made progress on engaging and supporting families during Year Three through the design and award of targeted family engagement grants throughout the state, as well as the expansion of evidence based home visiting in the state's four Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs).

Family Engagement Partnership and Opportunity Grants

DECAL offered two grant opportunities to deepen family engagement strategies and understanding across the state in Year Three. The first grant, released as Family Engagement Community Grants, was made available to Family Connection Partnership Collaboratives across the state. The Request for Proposals was sent to Family Connection collaboratives across the state. A total of 27 applications were received and the top scoring 21 collaboratives were awarded grants of \$10,000 each. The grants were for one year with start dates in either June or July of 2016.

Activities funded by the RTT-ELC Family Engagement Community grants and conducted by the collaboratives included hosting parent meetings/cafes and other family events, providing supports for transportation and other resources to increase family engagement and participation in school and community activities, development and distribution of literacy brochures, children's books and other items of interest to families, and providing translation services at parent/teacher conferences and school family events.

The second family engagement grant opportunity awarded in Year Three was released as the Family Engagement Opportunity Grant. These funds were targeted to the state's four Early Education Empowerment Zones and metro Atlanta, and were designed to 1) increase availability and accessibility to quality family engagement programs, activities, and opportunities; 2) provide supplemental educational outlets that promote, encourage, and support community awareness and advocacy; and 3) provide access to free, ongoing parent leadership and child development resources. DECAL conducted two trainings with potential Family Engagement Opportunity Grant applicants in January 2016, in Atlanta at the DECAL offices and in the Clarke County E3Z. In January, 2016, DECAL received a total of 105 applications for funding. Five Family Engagement Opportunity Grantees were selected in February 2016, and contracts were fully executed as of April 1, 2016 with award amounts ranging from \$8,300 to \$15,000.

Offerings of Family Engagement Opportunity Grant programs have included mindfulness training for parents (evaluated and documented by Georgia State University), Strengthening Families curriculum delivery for families, including families assigned to grantee by Drug Courts, family field trips to supplemental educational opportunities such as strawberry farms, nutritious meal cooking classes delivered by the University of Georgia's Cooperative Extension program, and trainings for families on physical fitness, child abuse awareness and prevention, family literacy, and more.

In Year Four, DECAL plans to examine the summative reporting and evaluation of these grant opportunities to inform ongoing family engagement work as part of the state's TQRIS implementation and resources targeting

recipients of the state's child care subsidy program.

Home Visiting Initiatives

Georgia is implementing a Maternal and Early Childhood System of Care called Great Start Georgia. Great Start Georgia provides wide-ranging support services for families and children to ensure that families have the information and referrals they need to provide a great start in life. Great Start Georgia (GSG) begins with First Steps, which screens families and connects them to parenting resources and community services that improve child and family well-being. Evidence-based home visiting is available for families with more intensive needs. With RTT-ELC funds, the Great Start Georgia framework, including evidence-based home visiting, is being implemented through a partnership with a licensed child care learning center in each of the state's four Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs). This expansion includes a central intake component that provides community outreach, identification and referral of families to GSG, intake screening, parent education, and linkage of families to resources and services.

In Year Three, the state continued providing successful direct service implementation in the four E3Zs. Evaluation reports collected in Year Three demonstrate that home visiting programs across all four E3Zs are serving families with fidelity to their models and meeting or exceeding all contract deliverables. Community awareness and acceptance of the programs have grown as demonstrated by meeting these deliverables and by the volume and frequency of community outreach activities to promote program outcomes.

First Steps services have been successfully established within each of the Great Start Georgia E3Z hubs. Specific implementation activities have included (at each hub): (1) the development of protocols and procedures for engaging families for First Steps screening and ongoing resource assistance, (2) First Steps training of all intake staff and supervisors, (3) the creation of "parent packets" which contain information about local and statewide resources on key issues affecting family health.

Technical assistance, training and support in implementing home visiting remained a focus for the state in Year Three, and all E3Z sites received two site visits by GSG technical assistance providers. Home visiting staff have participated in a variety of training to enhance skills and engage in peer networking, including but not limited to:

- Parents as Teachers (PAT) E3Z sites received intensive training on the Penelope Data System from the GA PAT State Office and the PAT National Center in April 2016.
- Healthy Families Georgia E3Z Program Manager and Clinical Supervisors achieved GKI RE-MAP (Relationship-Exploration & Education-Motivation-Administration-Professional Development) Supervision Training certification in July 2016, where staff learned the primary functions and types of supervision and practiced using strength-based communication strategies and GKI reflective and clinical supervision tools.
- All GSG staff participated in the 2016 Georgia Home Visiting Institute on August 22, 2016, with a focus on special issues within home visiting (e.g., poverty, maternal depression, working with teen parents, engagement of fathers), self-care, and motivational interviewing.
- All GSG staff and supporting E3Z partners participated in the 2016 Early Learning Challenge GSG Focus Group on August 23, 2016 to reflect on their successes and opportunities for improvement following their first full year of service delivery.
- GSG staff participated in regional, model-specific Revised Performance Measure trainings that were provided by the GSG Technical Assistance and Quality Team in September 2016 that covered the basic components of new data elements as well as the programmatic features of "moving the needle" on each performance measurement.
- All GSG staff received training on new screening and assessment tools adopted by October 1 2016: (1) Ages & Stages Questionnaire®: Social Emotional, Second Edition and (2) intimate partner violence tools that replaced the current Domestic Violence Assessment tool: (a) Relationship Assessment Tool (RAT) and (b) Hurt, Insult, Threaten and Scream (HITS).
- PAT E3Z supervisors attended a two-day Advanced Supervision Summit facilitated by the PAT National Center in September 2016.

Since the formal launch of the home visiting programs in July of 2015 through the conclusions of 2016:

- 1453 Families have been screened
- 291 families were enrolled in home visiting programs.

- 2,713 home visits were completed.
- 267 Ages & Stages Questionnaire®, Third Edition (ASQ-3) screenings were completed.
- 1,456 referrals made to service providers for any family members of the enrolled mothers. Of these, 944 were followed up on and 361 were “completed” (meaning families are receiving services).
- 41 active memorandums of understanding were established with other local service agencies.

Going into Year Four, the state will continue to focus on ongoing technical assistance and monitoring. Each E3Z GSG site will receive at least one quality assurance site visit, and staff will continue to participate in Quarterly Community of Practice conference calls. Also in Year Four, the North Georgia E3Z Parents as Teachers (PAT) program will participate in the Quality Endorsement accreditation process in and will receive additional technical assistance and site visits by the PAT State Office to help this site earn this recognition. Programs that earn the Quality Endorsement are recognized by the national Parents as Teachers office as exemplary Blue Ribbon Affiliates, delivering high-quality services to children and families. In Year Four, ongoing support will be provided as the administration of this project in the RTT-ELC grant will transition to the Georgia Department of Public Health, Maternal and Child Health Section effective January 1, 2017.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

(Section D(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in developing (check all that apply):

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

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

In Year Three, the state made gains in revising the state's workforce knowledge and competency framework and aligning the framework with national standards. The state employed a collaborative approach to these revisions by engaging stakeholders in this process to ensure a more comprehensive and inclusive vetting process.

Beginning in the summer of 2016, DECAL convened a work group to revise the state's Workforce Knowledge and Competency framework. The work group was comprised of early childhood professionals from across Georgia, representing a variety of areas of expertise, including DECAL staff, university and technical college faculty, trainers, child care resource and referral staff, child care center leaders and teachers, and staff from the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. With guidance from the Professional Learning Advisory Committee established in Year Two of Georgia's RTT-ELC grant, the Work Group drafted a set of competencies that are based upon the NAEYC Professional Preparation Standards.

Georgia submitted these revised competencies to national experts for review in September of 2016. The revised competencies were reviewed by representative from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and found to be in alignment with NAEYC Professional Preparation Standards. In addition, the state submitted the competencies for review to state experts in working with children with disabilities, as identified by the Division for Early Childhood (DEC). Georgia's revised competencies were only found to be in partial alignment with DEC Recommended Practices and DEC Personnel Preparation Standards. Edits to the revised competencies based on this alignment feedback began in late 2016 and is expected to be completed in January 2017.

In Year Four, DECAL will complete the revision and rollout of the state's Workforce Knowledge and Competency framework and build additional professional development opportunities in alignment with the postsecondary system. In early 2017, the state plans to gather public comment on the newly revised and aligned Workforce Knowledge and Competency framework. After the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework is approved and finalized, the state will develop professional learning pathways for early learning professionals in various roles to acquire the competencies. Finally, in Year Four, the state will align the professional learning plans within Quality Rated, the state's TQRIS, and higher education coursework with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency framework and professional learning pathways.

Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.

(Section D(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs with the goal of improving child outcomes (check all that apply):

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

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

The state made considerable progress in Year Three in improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the early childhood education workforce. Throughout 2016, the state moved forward in providing financial incentives for obtaining initial and higher credentials, creating a statewide system for delivering Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and designing a statewide coaching certification.

Financial Incentives for Credentials

In Year One, the state created AWARDS for early educators (www.decalscholars.com) with Early Learning Challenge grant dollars to reward early care and education (ECE) professionals for earning higher early childhood education credentials and degrees than the credential or degree they currently hold. Payments amounts are based on the credential/degree level. The utilization of this program by early childhood educators throughout the first three years of RTT-ELC has exceeded expectations

The annual budget for AWARDS as proposed in the state's RTT-ELC budget capped the amount and number of Awards for each payment by degree type. The original cap of 100 AWARDS payments for CDA recipients was exceeded in a matter of a few weeks in early 2016. When the state's RTT-ELC budget amendment was approved

midway through Year Three, the state added additional funding to this project to allow the continued to support CDA recipients, while also targeting priority groups, such as infant and toddler teachers, family providers. Going forward into Year Four, the state will develop a more structured system to target priority groups of teachers to meet the needs of special populations of children in the ECE system.

2016 AWARDS

Credential Type, Number of Credentials, Total Dollar Amount Awarded

CDA, 106, \$127,200.00

TCC, 129, \$154,800.00

TCD, 66, \$99,000.00

AAS, 58, \$87,000.00

BA, 60, \$150,000.00

MA, 12, \$30,000.00

TOTAL: 431 credentials, \$648,000.00 awarded

Professional Learning Communities

In Georgia's Race to the Top Early-Learning Challenge Grant application, the state laid out plans for a four-tiered approach to Professional Development, called the Georgia Professional Development Hierarchy (GPDH), designed to move Georgia's early childhood educators from the knowledge phase to the high-performing application phase. The hierarchy starts with a broad audience of stakeholder groups and awareness-level content in tier one and becomes more targeted to early childhood educators teaching students birth to age five with focused content that supports high-quality teacher child interactions in the top tiers. As individuals move from tier to tier, professionals begin applying their knowledge of early learning and development to their own instructional approach with support from coaches and mentors.

In Year Three, the state continued to build competencies focusing on the top two levels of the GPDH. In 2016, DECAL continued the partnership with the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning to create a statewide Professional Learning Community (PLC) system. In May 2016, the first cohort of 47 participants completed the Lastinger Center's intensive PLC training. To date, staff who participated in Cohort 1 have conducted over 130 hours of PLCs with early learning providers and teachers. Training for the second cohort began during Year Three, and 76 participants completed three days of training and are expected to complete the full PLC training program by May 2017.

To support sustainability of this project, DECAL also contracted with the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning to provide a formal PLC Facilitator Certification as well as a PLC Apprenticeship opportunity to participants from Cohort 1 during Year Three of RTT-ELC in Georgia. 34 participants from Cohort 1 are participating in the PLC Facilitator Certification and are expected to earn their certification by spring 2017. Meanwhile, during Year Three, six participants from Cohort 1 are currently serving as apprentice facilitators for Cohort 2, working alongside the Lastinger Center staff. Current apprentices will move on to serve as lead facilitators for Cohort 3 in fall 2017. Moving forward, additional apprentices will be selected from each cohort, working toward sustainability of the PLC Facilitator Training in the state, without continued reliance on the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning

Due to strong interest in the PLC Facilitator Training from DECAL's leadership team and a desire to support staff members who have completed Facilitator Training, an Executive PLC training experience is in development to be delivered in Year Four of the grant.

Statewide Coach Designation System

In Year Three, the state also moved forward with the design and implementation of a statewide coaching designation system. DECAL partnered with Clayton Early Learning and Qualistar Colorado to create and deliver a Foundations of Coaching course, which was delivered to 14 participants, including directors, center owners, and coaches in May 2016. The state also made plans to deliver a second course to 20 participants in Year Four, with plans to broaden the audience to include coaches and staff from DECAL's child care licensing technical assistance unit.

DECAL also convened a work group to create a coach designation system in Year Three. The state once again partnered with University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning to provide technical assistance to the work

group on the design of coach designation. The state identified and convened coaching experts from a variety of backgrounds to serve on the work group, including DECAL staff, Child Care Resource and Referral staff, university faculty, trainers, and master coaches. The work group met throughout 2016, and identified four areas of focus:

1. Creating coach competencies:
 2. Identifying professional learning needed for coaches
 3. Developing a common language around coaching
 4. Actual development of the coach designation system (e.g., policies and procedures, training requirements)
- Action item #1 is anticipated to be complete by January 2017, while the others will take place on an ongoing basis.

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

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

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

Baseline and Annual Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	31	31	31	31	31
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	4,333	4,500	4,950	5,445	5,990

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.

Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	31	43	43	50	
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	4,333	5,546	5,339	4,778	

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

The Technical College System of Georgia awarded 1,977 technical certificates of credit, technical college diplomas, and associate degrees, the University System of Georgia awarded 1,778 bachelor's, master's, specialist, and doctoral degrees, and Georgia independent colleges awarded 232 bachelor's and master's degrees related to early childhood education during the 2016 academic year, as reported by Georgia's statewide longitudinal data system (GA AWARDS). The Council for Professional Recognition reports 791 Child Development Associate credentials awarded in fiscal year 2016 (10/1/2015 - 9/30/2016).

The number of aligned institutions was under-reported in the baseline data and should have been 43; in 2013, there were 24 technical colleges within the Technical College System of Georgia and 18 colleges and universities within the University System of Georgia that offer credential or degree programs aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. In 2015, the number of technical colleges decreased to 23 due to mergers, while the number of colleges and universities increased to 20. In 2016, the number of technical colleges decreased to 22 due to a merger. Eight independent colleges in Georgia awarding aligned degrees have been added for 2016. In addition, the Council for Professional Recognition offers the Child Development Associate, a national credential that is aligned to Georgia's framework.

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

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

The state fell short of its target for the number of credentials awarded in 2016. In part, this is due to the overall decline in the number of early learning programs in the state, and the data demonstrates that fewer programs are serving more children per program. The state is currently conducting additional research to better understand the reduction in early learning programs.

However, the state has also invested in various initiatives in place to continue supporting early educators to obtain higher credentials. These include the initiatives related to Scholarships and Incentives. The state is also piloting grants for child care providers (similar to the Georgia's Pre-K Program) that require higher salaries based on credential levels, which may incentivize early educators to obtain higher credentials. Georgia is also in the process of revising our workforce competencies that will enable the state's technical colleges and universities to better support early educators with increased opportunities for additional credentials and degrees.

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

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

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.										
Baseline and Annual Targets										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	5,894	15%	6,814	17%	6,950	17%	7,923	19%	8,507	20%
<i>Specify:</i>	Child Development Associate (CDA)									
Credential Type 2	3,929	10%	4,008	10%	4,497	11%	5,004	12%	5,529	23%
<i>Specify:</i>	Technical College Early Childhood Care and Education Certificate of Credit									
Credential Type 3	2,358	6%	2,405	6%	2,862	7%	2,919	7%	3,403	8%
<i>Specify:</i>	Technical College Early Childhood Care and Education Diploma									
Credential Type 4	4,715	12%	4,810	12%	5,315	13%	5,421	13%	5,955	14%
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Care and Education Associate Degree (AA, AAS)									
Credential Type 5	5,108	13%	5,210	13%	5,315	13%	5,838	14%	5,955	14%
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelors Degrees (including BS in Education, Major in Birth-Five)									
Credential Type 6	2,358	6%	2,405	6%	2,453	6%	2,502	6%	2,552	6%
<i>Specify:</i>	Masters, Specialist and Doctoral Degrees (M.S., M.Ed., M.A.T., Ph.D.)									
Credential Type 7	14,932	38%	14,429	36%	13,491	33%	12,093	29%	10,633	25%
<i>Specify:</i>	Non-credentialed									
Credential Type 8	39,294		40,080		40,881		41,699		42,533	
<i>Specify:</i>	Total									
Credential Type 9										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 10										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 11										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 12										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 13										
<i>Specify:</i>										

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

Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	5,894	15%			7,240	13%				
<i>Specify:</i>	Child Development Associate (CDA)									
Credential Type 2	3,929	10%			2,648	5%				
<i>Specify:</i>	Technical College Early Childhood Care and Education Certificate of Credit									
Credential Type 3	2,358	6%			1,619	3%				
<i>Specify:</i>	Technical College Early Childhood Care and Education Diploma									
Credential Type 4	4,715	12%			4,967	9%				
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Care and Education Associate Degree (AA, AAS)									
Credential Type 5	5,108	13%			8,821	16%				
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelors Degrees (including BS in Education, Major in Birth-Five)									
Credential Type 6	2,358	6%			3,408	6%				
<i>Specify:</i>	Masters, Specialist and Doctoral Degrees (M.S., M.Ed., M.A.T., Ph.D.)									
Credential Type 7	14,932	38%			25,898	47%				
<i>Specify:</i>	Non-credentialed									
Credential Type 8	39,294				54,601					
<i>Specify:</i>	Total									
Credential Type 9										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 10										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 11										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 12										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 13										
<i>Specify:</i>										

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

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

For the baseline, Georgia's total workforce was estimated using child care licensing, Pre-K, Head Start, and special needs program data (including directors, lead teachers, assistant teachers, family child care providers and assistants, group child care providers and assistants, inclusion teachers, early intervention specialists, early childhood special educators, family service workers, and home visitors). Baseline credential data were estimated using Professional Development Registry (PDR) data, workforce findings from the studies of child care quality in Georgia conducted by the FPG Child Development Institute (Maxwell, et al., 2009a; 2009c; 2010a; Appendices 3, 4, and 5 of Georgia's RTT-ELC application), and workforce findings from the study of the economic impact of the Georgia child care industry (Child Policy Partnership, 2008). The total workforce for the baseline was estimated at 39,294, and 62% of the workforce were estimated to hold one of the above credentials. For the original targets, a 2% growth in total workforce was estimated per year, for a 2017 workforce of 42,553, of whom 75% will hold one of the above credentials. Registration in the PDR is currently required for educators in Quality Rated and Georgia's Pre-K programs but optional for other early learning programs and is therefore not representative of the total workforce. Full workforce credential data will become available when all early learning programs are participating in Quality Rated.

In Year Two, workforce data were collected through a provider survey for a study commissioned by Georgia of the economic impact of the child care industry. Year Two credentials have been estimated based on: 1) this study's workforce credential estimates and average staff per early learning provider, 2) Georgia's administrative data regarding the number of early learning providers at year's end, and 3) Pre-K workforce data from Georgia's Professional Development Registry. It should be noted that the total workforce of 54,570 estimated for Year Two is significantly higher than the estimate of 39,294 used in the baseline.

In the absence of new studies that might identify a change in credential levels, complete workforce data size and credentials by level are not available for Year One and Year Three. Therefore Year One and Year Three estimates have not been provided. Georgia is currently finalizing a child care market rate survey that includes questions about child care staff credentials. Results are expected by April 30, 2017.

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

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

As discussed in the data notes section, the state has received no additional data on Georgia's early education workforce. However, the biggest change from the baseline to Year 2 was an increase in the number of estimated professionals and an increase in the non-credentialed workforce. The state is now able to report the percentage with the highest credential of a CDA. The biggest challenge for the state is to decrease the percentage of non-credentialed early childhood educators. As discussed in Section (D)(1), the DECAL Scholars program has proven to be more successful than anticipated. As Georgia continues to allocate more resources to this program, it is expected that the percentage of CDAs will increase (this has been the most popular credential earned with the program) and the percentage of non-credentialed will decrease. Additionally, Governor Deal has requested additional funds for Georgia's Pre-K teacher salaries. The increase in salaries should help retain teachers with master's degrees. The state will continue to examine the methodology used in computing workforce data and will develop additional strategies to address areas where the targets are not being met.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

The State has made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that (check all that apply):

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

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.

Georgia's Kindergarten Entry Assessment, the "Readiness Check," will be a component of the Georgia Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (GKIDS). GKIDS is a year-long performance-based assessment aligned to the state's learning standards and is used as a formative assessment in all public kindergarten classrooms across the state.

The Readiness Check will provide formative assessment information during the first six weeks of kindergarten in order to equip educators, parents, and the state with high-quality information about individual student readiness so that appropriate supports and interventions can be established as needed. The Readiness Check is based on the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS), which include the following domains: 1) Physical Development and Motor Skills; 2) Social and Emotional Development; 3) Approaches to Play and Learning; 4) Communication, Language, and Literacy; and 5) Cognitive Development and General Knowledge.

In the late summer and early fall of Year Three, the state conducted an Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) study to inform the roll-out of the Readiness Check. Narrative and video vignettes of the assessment items were developed and utilized, as well as subject matter experts to determine true scores. One teacher from each participating district and school was invited to participate in the IRR study, and 101 teachers registered for one of the ten live webinar sessions conducted via GoToTraining. Participants in the IRR study viewed the videos and read narrative vignettes of students performing the assessment items, then rated student performance and submitted their scores. A total of 237 video and narrative vignette performance samples were evaluated.

Generally speaking, the IRR study found that inter-rater agreement rate was very high, indicating good reliability evidence for the Readiness Check and its associated scoring. The average exact agreement was at 79% and the average adjacent agreement rate was at 15%, with the total agreement rate (combining exact and adjacent agreement) was 94%. The state will continue to use the findings from this study to inform the statewide launch of the Readiness Check in Year Four.

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

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) is the lead state agency responsible for the development of the Readiness Check. In the spring of 2016, the full set of Readiness Check activities was field tested in 25 Georgia's Pre-K classrooms across the state. Student performance data and qualitative teacher feedback from the Pre-K field test was collected and reviewed to inform revisions to the assessment to prepare for the inaugural launch in the fall of 2016. A committee of ten Pre-K, Kindergarten, and First grade teachers and representatives from DECAL, the Georgia Center for Assessment (GCA), and GaDOE reviewed field test data, usability ratings, and made necessary recommendations for revisions and updates. In addition, the field test review committee previewed the Inaugural Launch teacher training modules to provide feedback.

In Year Three, GaDOE developed online training modules to support the inaugural launch of the Readiness Check. GaDOE contracted with Georgia Public Broadcasting (GPB) to film students participating in Readiness Check activities. Video clips will be used in online training modules to demonstrate administration and scoring of the Readiness Check activities. A series of five training modules were developed for the Inaugural Launch teacher training. To insure easy access to the online training modules, all training materials and resources were contained in the GKIDS online portal system for ease of access by Kindergarten teachers and school and system leaders.

In the fall of 2016, the Readiness Check was launched in a representative sample of kindergarten classrooms, one school per district (sample size approximately 20,000 students). A Train the trainer model was utilized with a series of live Informational and Training webinars, which were recorded and available for viewing later. Student performance data and qualitative teacher feedback were collected during the inaugural launch to inform revisions to the assessment before the full statewide launch scheduled for the fall of 2017.

The data collected during the inaugural launch was reviewed by a Benchmarking Committee that met during the fall of 2016. Nine PreK, Kindergarten, and First grade teachers participated in the benchmarking meeting along with representatives from DECAL, GaDOE and the Georgia Center for Assessment. Teachers recommended threshold descriptions for the three domains (Foundations of School Success, English Language Arts, and Math) and the overall Readiness recommendation, given the expectations at the domains.

Going into Year Four, the state will continue to develop additional resources to support teachers and school leaders in administering the Readiness Check, and to support parents and families in understanding the results of the assessment in preparation for the full statewide launch in the fall of 2017. GaDOE has contracted with Georgia Public Broadcasting to design and develop a public parent resource site, which will include background information, description of Readiness Check activities, and resources for helping their child at home.

The Georgia Department of Education will also deliver a "What to Expect" and a "Continued Support" webinar series throughout Year Four to provide continued support to teachers and school system leaders. This webinar series will be presented monthly for teachers and leaders to communicate and preview 2017-2018 changes to Kindergarten, including the Readiness Check and revisions to GKIDS. The Continued Support webinar series will provide guidance and support for teachers and leaders as they administer, report, and interpret the Readiness Check.

In the fall of 2017, the Readiness Check will be launched state-wide in all Kindergarten classrooms. As described above, the state is making continuous efforts through communication, training, and materials to fully integrate the Readiness Check into the already-established GKIDS. Official training will be offered statewide for teachers and leaders on the Readiness Check from late May through early August.

The state is also in the process of develop reporting structures, and reporting shells will be developed and presented to a committee of kindergarten teachers for review to prepare for the statewide launch.

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

The State has made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that (check all that apply):

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

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

Prior to winning an Early Learning Challenge grant, DECAL had already begun construction of an early learning and development data system called the Cross Agency Child Data System (CACDS) to align with the state's Longitudinal Data System. In Year Three of the RTT-ELC, Georgia made significant progress in enhancing CACDS by deepening partnerships with the Department of Public Health (DPH), Department of Human Services (DHS), the Department of Education (DOE), the Governor's Office of Student Achievement (GOSA), and Head Start and Early Head Start grantees. In 2016, the state completed the buildout of the foundational elements of CACDS.

Street addresses from all data sources in CACDS are standardized through a data cleansing routine utilizing US Postal Service data. Data is tightly integrated with GA AWARDS, which is the state's Pre-K through -Workforce Longitudinal Data System housed at the Governor's Office of Student Achievement (GOSA). Each child in CACDS is assigned a GA-AWARDS ID to insure the two systems are integrated. In Year Three, the state completed adding the following data sources to the CACDS database:

- Early Head Start and Head Start
- CAPS (Child Care Subsidy)
- PANDA (Georgia's Pre-K)
- KOALA (Child Care Licensing)
- Work Sampling (Georgia's Pre-K Child-level Assessment)
- Quality Rated (Georgia's TQRIS)
- Babies Can't Wait (IDEA Part C)
- Pre-school Special Education (IDEA Part B - 619)
- Department of Labor
- Census Data

The state also made substantial progress in linking Children 1st (screening and referral data), Foster Care, and Home Visitation data, and has plans to begin incorporating participation data from TANF, SNAP, and the Georgia Professional Development System.

As the state enters Year Four of RTT-ELC, it will make a strong effort to re-engage internal and external stakeholders. In the first quarter of Year Four, a public website with standard research reports will launch. Additionally, the state will develop and implement policy for internal and external research requests.

Other Data System Supports

To better support child care providers, the state also made strides in Year Three towards moving more provider facing services online, enhancing data systems to support professional development, and enriching online consumer awareness tools. A critical goal of the Early Learning Challenge Grant is to enable uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating Programs. The Department of Early Care and Learning's Provider Self-Service platform allows licensed child care centers and homes to complete transactions and update information directly into the state data system. In addition, the state is using RTT-ELC funds to allow the state's Child Care Resource and Referral Agency Call Center to have a direct interface into the state data system for family-facing referral and data collection purposes.

In Year Three, the state added the capacity for child care providers to pay license fees, pay enforcement fines, and process criminal records checks for employees online. These services have been well received by the child care community, with 95% of license fees paid online in 2016, 4,648 license certificates generated and emailed, 367 enforcement fines processed through the automated system; and 26,690 records checks were processed through the automated system. In criminal records checks usage by providers increased from 29.16% submitted online in January to 87% submitted online in December.

Moving forward into Year Four, the state will use RTT-ELC to 1) Build an interface for the CCR&R call center to DECAL data systems to utilize and add to data to the state licensing system, 2) Expand Provider Self Service to allow provider data previously collected by the Call Center to be input directly in the DECAL data system by providers, and 3) Enhance the family-facing QualityRated.org site to allow the public to take advantage of additional data fields when searching online for child care. These enhancements are expected to be implemented by summer 2014.

Finally, in Year Three, DECAL launched the Georgia Professional Development System (GA PDS), which consolidates the Professional Development Registry and Training Registration Systems into one convenient, responsive web application. In GA PDS, teachers can maintain credentials and search and register for training, and trainers can schedule trainings, maintain rosters, and mark training completions. Through GA PDS, training completions automatically update teacher records, saving teachers from having to send in certificates of completion for verification. In Year Three, DECAL moved all in-house trainings, including those from Child Care Licensing, Infant Toddler, Inclusion, Quality Rated, and Georgia's Pre-K to GA PDS. Since the integrated system launched in August of 2016, 15,546 teachers have enrolled in trainings through the system. In Year Four, all Georgia approved trainings will be required to be scheduled and maintained through the GA PDS, and the state's Training/Trainer Approval System, currently housed at the University of Georgia, will be re-written and integrated into the GA PDS as well.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development.

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income¹ families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	67,262	51.61%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	134,532	51.61%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	209,433	51.61%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	411,227	51.61%

¹ Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.

Data Table A(1)-1 Data Notes

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

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that 51.61% of children ages 0-5 in Georgia are in families with income less than 200% of the poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates).

According to the U.S. Census 2015 Population Estimates, the total number of children 0-5 in Georgia is 796,792, including 130,327 under age 1, 260,669 ages 1 and 2, and 405,796 ages 3-5 (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2016). Since low-income data are not available by single years of age, the number reported for each age group above is the total population multiplied by 51.61%.

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

The State should use these data to guide its thinking about where specific activities may be required to address special populations' unique needs.

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays ¹	18,681	2.34%
Are English learners ²	125,917	15.8%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	0	0%
Are migrant ³	3,283	0.41%
Are homeless ⁴	36,622	4.6%
Are in foster care	8,650	1.1%
Other 1 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

¹For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).

²For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English.

³For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2).

⁴The term "homeless children" has the meaning given the term "homeless children and youths" in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).

Data Table A(1)-2 Data Notes

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

All percentages are based on a Georgia 0-5 population of 796,792, following the U.S. Census 2016 Population Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2016).

Disabilities or Developmental Delays: 8,301 children ages 0-2 had an IFSP under IDEA Part C based on December 1, 2016, federal data count. 10,380 children ages 3 to kindergarten entry had an IEP at the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year under IDEA Part B, section 619 (Georgia Department of Education, October 2016 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System). Of the students served in IDEA Part B, section 619, Georgia's Pre-K reports 2,672 children with an IEP, 3.3% of all Pre-K students (2016-2017 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2016). Early Head Start and Head Start report a cumulative enrollment of 2,755 children (9.5%) with an IEP or IFSP (Program Information Report, 2016).

English learners: 15.8% of the population 5 to 17 years of age in Georgia speaks a language other than English at home, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates. This percentage has been applied to the 0-5 population, for whom these data are not reported. 7,198 Georgia's Pre-K students (8.9%) are identified by providers as dual language learners, defined as having a primary language other than English (2016-2017 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2016). 3,646 Early Head Start and Head Start enrollees (12.5%) have a primary language other than English (Program Information Report, 2016).

Migrant: 0.412% of kindergarten to grade 3 students in Georgia in 2015-2016 were eligible for the Migrant Education Program (Consolidated State Performance Report). This same percentage has been applied here to the 0-5 population, for whom eligibility is less comprehensively determined. Local education agencies report serving 1,040 migrant children ages 3

to 5 who are not in kindergarten and 576 migrant kindergartners in 2015-2016 (Consolidated State Performance Report), while Migrant and Seasonal Head Start reports a cumulative enrollment of 323 children (Program Information Report, 2016).

Homeless: The National Center on Family Homelessness (NCFH) uses the number of students identified as homeless by local education agencies (LEAs), as required by the McKinney-Vento Act, to estimate the number of homeless children ages 0-5, based on research estimating that 51% of all homeless children are under age 6 (*America's Youngest Outcasts: A Report Card on Child Homelessness*. [2014]. Waltham, MA: The National Center on Family Homelessness at American Institutes for Research. Pp. 99-101). In the 2015-2016 school year, LEAs in Georgia identified 35,186 homeless students in grades 1 through 12 (Consolidated State Performance Report). The 0-5 number estimated here follows the NCFH method and assumes the count for grades 1 through 12 represents 49% of all children. LEAs report serving 846 homeless children ages 3 to 5 who are not in kindergarten and 3,654 homeless kindergartners in 2015-2016 (Consolidated State Performance Report), while Early Head Start and Head Start report serving 617 homeless children (Program Information Report, 2016).

Foster care: Unique children ages 0-5 who were in foster care in 2016, with age calculated as of the child's first day in custody during the calendar year (Georgia SHINES data system, 1/9/2017).

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

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

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool			45,042	45,042
<i>Specify:</i>	Georgia's Pre-K Program (4 year olds only)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2016-2017 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2016			
Early Head Start and Head Start¹	1,084	4,002	23,820	28,906
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Head Start Program Information Report, 2016			
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619	975	7,326	10,380	18,681
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Part C: Federal data counts, December 1, 2016; Part B: October 2016 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	3,508	14,286	20,512	38,106
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Maximus CCDF data system, 2017			
Other 1	725	582	242	1,549
<i>Specify:</i>	Great Start Georgia Home Visiting" (includes MIECHV plus other funding sources)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Georgia Home Visiting Information System (GEOHVIS), 2017			
Other 2				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 3				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 4				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 5				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

Table (A)(1)-3a - Additional Other rows

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
Other 6				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 7				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 8				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

¹ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Data Table A(1)-3a Data Notes

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

State-funded preschool: Georgia's Pre-K is a universal program, not targeted to special populations, and does not collect child income data nor home language data. The total number of children with high needs in Georgia's Pre-K is an estimate based on counting all enrolled children who were marked as having an IEP, having limited English proficiency, or participating in a means-tested benefit, as reported by grantee programs to the state (2016-2017 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2016). This count, while actual, is only approximate to the definition of children with high needs. By this method it is estimated that 55.8% of all Georgia's Pre-K students are children with high needs. PeachCare, Georgia's Child Health Insurance Program, was removed from the means-tested benefit data collected by Georgia's Pre-K beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. As a result, the highest possible benefit eligibility that was counted for Georgia's Pre-K students dropped from 235% of the federal poverty level to 185% for students in school systems (free and reduced lunch) and 149% for students in private programs (Medicaid). This explains why the number of children with high needs served in Georgia's Pre-K appears to have dropped from the baseline.

Early Head Start and Head Start (including Migrant and Seasonal Head Start) cumulative enrollment reported; Early Head Start and Head Start funded enrollment is not available by age. Program Information Report, 2016 state-level summary report.

IDEA, Part C: December 1, 2016, federal data count.

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia Department of Education, October 2016 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2017-1).

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

CCDF: Average monthly children served in calendar year 2016 by age (Maximus data system, 2/3/2017). CCDF also served, on average, 20,291 children over the age of 5 per month.

MIECHV: Children active during calendar year 2016 in Great Start Georgia home visiting programs (Georgia Home Visiting Information System, 2017). Other funding streams in addition to MIECHV have been added to support Great Start Georgia home visiting, including Early Learning Challenge funds. Those served through these additional funds are included in the numbers given here.

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

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

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	9,636	98	1,731	20,240	68	1,635	11,622
<i>Specify:</i>	Georgia's Pre-K Program						
Early Head Start and Head Start¹	3,910	18	221	19,866	23	877	4,096
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	190	24	249	2,854	6	1,238	3,740
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,602	19	390	3,304	17	358	4,690
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	2,353	182	97	46,485	75	1,867	7,106
Other 1	362	32	60	770	1	20	261
<i>Describe:</i>	Great Start Georgia Home Visiting (includes MIECHV plus other funding sources)						
Other 2							
<i>Describe:</i>							

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

Table (A)(1)-3b - Additional Other rows

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
Other 3							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 4							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 5							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 6							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 7							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 8							
<i>Describe:</i>							

Data Table A(1)-3b Data Notes

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

State-funded preschool: 2016-2017 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2016. Totals here are for the 45,042 students identified as children with high needs (race and ethnicity were not available for 12 students). For all 80,699 students served, race and ethnicity is as follows: Hispanic: 12,628; non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native: 187; non-Hispanic Asian: 3,469; non-Hispanic Black or African American: 31,795; non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander: 126; non-Hispanic two or more races: 3,187; non-Hispanic White: 29,275; race and ethnicity not available: 32.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Cumulative enrollment, Program Information Report, 2016 state-level summary report. These counts include 203 pregnant women because the Program Information Report does not allow race and ethnicity to be disaggregated by age. In addition, the Program Information Report has counts by race for 76 non-Hispanic "Other" and 22 non-Hispanic "Unspecified."

IDEA, Part C: December 1, 2016, federal data count

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia Department of Education, October 2016 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2017-1)

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

CCDF: Average monthly children served in calendar year 2016 by race and ethnicity (Maximus data system, 2/3/2017). Total includes 20,291 children over the age of 5 served on average per month. Total does not include 233 children on

average whose families declined to report race and ethnicity.

MIECHV: Children active during calendar year 2016 in Great Start Georgia home visiting programs; race/ethnicity unrecorded for 43 children (Georgia Home Visiting Information System, 2017). Other funding streams in addition to MIECHV have been added to support Great Start Georgia home visiting, including Early Learning Challenge funds. Those served through these additional funds are included in the numbers given here.

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

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

Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start¹	0	0	0	\$1,139,456	
State-funded preschool	\$299,232,510	\$311,573,630	\$313,700,032	\$313,860,869	
<i>Specify:</i>	Georgia's Pre-K Program				
State contributions to IDEA Part C	\$9,127,631	\$9,127,631	\$9,127,631	\$9,127,631	
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$28,412,355	\$28,412,355	\$30,051,758	\$30,051,758	
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$52,469,461	\$54,234,300	\$30,051,758	\$52,981,912	
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	0	0	0	0	
Other State contributions 1	\$1,326,179	\$1,217,552	\$1,315,420	\$1,406,144	
<i>Specify:</i>	State funds for Child Care Services (licensing and administration)				
Other State contributions 2	\$3,099,816	\$3,099,816	\$3,099,816	\$3,107,215	
<i>Specify:</i>	HOPE Grants and HOPE Scholarships to students pursuing ECE certificate, diploma or degree				
Other State contributions 3	\$4,718,332	\$4,718,332	\$4,718,332	\$4,718,332	
<i>Specify:</i>	Children 1st screening referral and follow-up system				
Other State contributions 4	\$40,000				
<i>Specify:</i>	Title 1, ESEA				
Other State contributions 5	\$200,000	\$600,000	\$6,000,000	\$600,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Family Connection Partnership				
Other State contributions 6	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$7,046,493	
<i>Specify:</i>	Philanthropic contributions (United Way of Greater Atlanta: Quality Rated, Substitute Teacher Program, Get Ready to Read Program, Early Learning Property Management Program, Partners Advancing Childhood Education)				

Table (A)(1)-4 - Additional Other rows

Funding for each Fiscal Year

Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Other State contributions 7	\$155,000	\$180,000	\$220,000	\$1,300,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Philanthropic contributions (Georgia Early Education Alliance for Ready Students [GEEARS]: summer reading activities, Quality Rated public awareness)				
Other State contributions 8	\$1,914,438	\$2,000,000	\$1,553,000	\$1,553,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Philanthropic contributions (Atlanta Speech School, Rollins Center for Language and Literacy: professional development services to teachers in language and literacy for children birth to Pre-K)				
Total State contributions:	\$398,626,464	\$421,163,616	\$424,564,057	\$406,772,819	

¹ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

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

³ Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

Data Table A(1)-4 Data Notes

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

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

In addition to the philanthropic funds included in the table, Georgia Family Connection Partnership reports \$3,035,000 in awards received in calendar year 2016 to support Quality Rated, including awards from the Blank, Cousins, Dobbs, Fitzgerald, Peyton Anderson, Rich, Tull, Whitehead, Woodward, and Zeist foundations and from Chick-Fil-A, Georgia Power, Kaiser, and St. Mary's.

State contributions to IDEA Part C and Other State contributions 3 reflect carryovers from the 2014 baseline. Validated amounts for those sections could not be obtained at this time, but state investment in those sections either met or exceeded the baseline amounts in 2016. Other State Contributions 4 refers to a conference that was held in fiscal year 2013 but discontinued in fiscal year 2014.

More recent data indicates that the state contributions to special education for ages 3-5 in Year One should be \$29,176,324, raising the total Year One state contributions to \$421,927,585.

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

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

Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program¹					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
State-funded preschool (annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)	50,496	46,227	46,198	45,042	
<i>Specify:</i>	Georgia's Pre-K Program				
Early Head Start and Head Start² (funded enrollment)	25,396	23,682	24,541	26,146	
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 (annual December 1 count)	16,493	17,666	18,965	18,681	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA (total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)					
Programs receiving CCDF funds (average monthly served)	60,858	61,278	55,674	58,397	
Other 1	1,116	686	1,010	1,549	
<i>Describe:</i>	"Great Start Georgia Home Visiting" (includes MIECHV plus other funding sources)				
Other 2	7,519	8,185	8,185	8,301	
<i>Describe:</i>	IDEA Part C				
Other 3	8,974	9,481	9,481	10,380	
<i>Describe:</i>	IDEA Part B, Section 619				
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 6					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 7					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 8					
<i>Describe:</i>					

¹ Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.

² Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Data Table A(1)-5 Data Notes

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

State-funded preschool: 2016-2017 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2016.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Program Information Report, 2016 state-level summary report. Early Head Start and Head Start funded enrollment is reported here, as requested. However, Tables (A)(1)-3a and (A)(1)-3b report cumulative enrollment because funded enrollment cannot be reported by age or by race/ethnicity.

IDEA, Part C: December 1, 2016, federal data count

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia Department of Education, October 2016 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2017-1)

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

CCDF: Average monthly children served in calendar year 2016 (Maximus data system, 2/9/2017). Total includes 20,291 children over the age of 5 served on average per month.

MIECHV: Children active during calendar year 2016 in Great Start Georgia home visiting programs (Georgia Home Visiting Information System, 2017). Other funding streams in addition to MIECHV have been added to support Great Start Georgia home visiting, including Early Learning Challenge funds. Those served through these additional funds are included in the numbers given here. More recent data reveals that a more accurate baseline count would be 681 children active during calendar year 2013.

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

Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

Essential Domains of School Readiness	Age Groups		
	Infants	Toddlers	Preschoolers
Language and literacy development	X	X	X
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)	X	X	X
Approaches toward learning	X	X	X
Physical well-being and motor development	X	X	X
Social and emotional development	X	X	X

Data Table A(1)-6 Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

No changes in this table have occurred in Years Two or Three. The Year One description follows:

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

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

Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool		X	X	X	
<i>Specify:</i>	Georgia's Pre-K Program				
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	X	X	X	X	X
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	X	X			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619		X			X
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA					
Programs receiving CCDF funds					
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)	X	X	X	X	
Tier 1					
Tier 2	x	x	x	x	
Tier 3	x	x	x	x	
Tier 4					
Tier 5					
State licensing requirements			X		X
Other 1	X	X	X	X	
<i>Describe:</i>	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Grant (MIECHV)				
Other 2					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

Table (A)(1)-7 - Additional Other rows

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
Other 6					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 7					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 8					
<i>Describe:</i>					

Data Table A(1)-7 Notes

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

No changes in this table have occurred in Years Two or Three. The Year One descriptions follow:

Georgia's Pre-K uses Work Sampling Online as the formative assessment in all classes. Pre-K classrooms in TQRIS are sampled for ECERS-3 observations. The CLASS assessment is used annually to measure child-adult interactions in a rotating sample of Georgia's Pre-K classrooms.

Head Start and Early Head Start employ health and developmental screening, use developmental child assessment tools, and meet Head Start and Early Head Start performance standards regarding the environment. The CLASS is used for measuring adult/child interactions. Other child assessments include Galileo, Teaching Strategies Gold, High Scope, and Work Sampling System.

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

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

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

These elements are not currently required in CCDF.

Georgia's TQRIS tiers are assigned based on a point system. Screening measures and formative assessments are required for points at all tiers. All rated programs receive Environment Rating Scale observations (ITERS-R, ECERS-3, FCCERS-R); these instruments include a subscale related to interactions.

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

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

Budget and Expenditures

Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

Georgia's actual expenditures include both spent and encumbered funds from Year Three. During Year Three, Georgia benefited from the systems developed and scaffolded in Year Two that allowed the state to effectively sub award funds to early learning programs, educators, and other key RTT-ELC funding recipients.

The state also benefited from the majority of RTT-ELC funded staff positions being filled and remaining filled during the grant year. This allowed grant deliverables to be met, but the filled positions, combined with an increase mandatory state benefit cost and cost of living raises for state employees contributed to a slight over spend.

Overall, after two years of spending below budgeted amounts, the state is now spending according to plan and delivering on grant milestones as expected. Georgia is currently spending nearly \$1M/month across all projects. The state will carry forward unspent funds into Year Four, and plans to submit a no-cost extension request for Year Five. Plans for unspent dollars include continuing to fund technical assistance staff to support programs in increasing levels on the TQRIS, editing the year-long formative assessment given in Kindergarten to better complement the newly launched KEA, and continuing Quality Rated Subsidy Grants in order to be able to evaluate three different grant/contract models for delivering child care subsidy services, which will then inform how the state will use CCDF dollars to continue a subsidy grant model.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

As detailed in the project budget narratives below, Georgia will submit amendment requests where needed to move all unexpended Year Three funds to carry over into grant Year Four to support project activities planned for 2017. The state plans to use unspent funds from Years One and Two to support a no-cost extension to be submitted in early 2017.

Project Budget 1

Project Name: Grant Management

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The state overspent slightly in personnel and benefit lines due to cost of living salary increases given to state employees. COLA adjustments were not being offered by the state at the time the RTT-ELC application was submitted, so they were not factored into the budget.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

The state will submit a budget amendment to account for current and anticipated salaries and benefits for Year Four, as well as for a no-cost extension year.

Project Budget 2

Project Name: Early Education Empowerment Zones

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The major discrepancy between the State's budgeted and actual costs for Project 2 was in Personnel, Fringe Benefits, and Funds to Be Distributed to Early Learning Programs. Hired positions were brought in at salaries below those initially anticipated. Additionally, developing the grant process for the child care expansion grants in partnership with the Department of Community Affairs took longer than initially expected. However, now that the infrastructure is in place, funds to be distributed to early learning programs will be spent down at greater speed.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

In its budget amendment, the state will roll over unspent line 11 funds, personnel, and fringe benefit funds towards Year Four. The state will also include these items in its request for a no-cost extension year.

Project Budget 3

Project Name: Quality Rated Access and Availability

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The major discrepancy between the State's budgeted and actual costs for Project 3 was in Personnel and Fringe Benefits, as well as Funds to be Distributed. RTT-ELC positions to support this project were hired at salaried under those anticipated in the budget narrative. Georgia's child care subsidy grants were fully implemented in this year, accounting for the discrepancy in line 11.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

DECAL will work with our program officers to submit the necessary amendments and no-cost extension request to carry over unspent funds in Year Three to support the Quality Rated subsidy contracts and reduced parent co-pay projects, as well as staff to administer these projects.

Project Budget 4

Project Name: Quality Rated Validation

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The state began its formal, external Validation Study of its TQRIS in Year Three. Thus, contractual spending was high. The state slightly overspent on personnel and fringe benefits due to cost of living adjustments given to all state employees, as well as mandatory increases in benefit costs for state employees.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

The state will submit a budget amendment to account for current and prospective future salary and fringe benefit increases, as well as to accurately capture contractual spending.

Project Budget 5

Project Name: Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The major discrepancy in Year Three occurred in personnel and associated fringe and travel. The Georgia Early Learning and Development (GELDS) Manager position remained vacant for much of the year. While staff time from other projects kept the initiatives and deliverables moving forward on time, the state struggled to find a qualified candidate to fill the position funded by this project. The state overspent in the contractual line due to projects that were delayed in Year One- namely the creation of PEACH- came to fruition in Year Three.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

The state will submit a budget amendment to adjust unspent funds to different budget categories within the project to best support the utilization of the GELDS.

Project Budget 6

Project Name: Comprehensive Assessment System

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Contractual expenses initially anticipated in Years One and Two came to fruition during Year Three. Otherwise, there were no major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

There are no substantive changes anticipated to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year. Since this project is now complete, DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent funds into other projects.

Project Budget 7

Project Name: Statewide Family Engagement and Community Grants

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The unanticipated funding for contractual funded staff to lead the training sessions also supported by the spending in the "other" line item. In addition, to save staff resources from having to award multiple rounds of grant funding, the state issues all line eleven funds in Years Two and Three of this project. Thus, while it looks like the state has overspent slightly on this project, it will not overspend over the four years of the grant.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

The state will submit the necessary budget amendments to insure spending is accurately reflected in the correct year and budget line item.

Project Budget 8

Project Name: Center-based Home Visitation and FFN Care

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The Department of Human Services decided to contribute personnel time to this project from non-RTT-ELC funding sources in Year Three. The state spent down funds to be distributed previously budgeted in years One and Two through its successful family engagement opportunity grants.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

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

Project Budget 9

Project Name: Workforce Knowledge and Competencies

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Unspent personnel and related costs are due to lower than budgeted for hiring salaries. Additionally, the contract for the review of the WKC came in significantly under budget, due to the fact that the state decided the services of a facilitator rather than a subject matter expert would be more strategic to gain stakeholder buy-in.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Georgia will work with our Project Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to move unspent Year Three funding across the remaining year of the grant to support additional staff capacity in supporting the Professional Development Registry and to ensure that the committee overseeing the revisions to the WKC has the resources needed to be successful.

Project Budget 10

Project Name: Supporting Early Educators

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The state had more early childhood educators take advantage of the AWARDS for early educators program in Year Two, thus the state cut back on accepting applications in Year Three. Guidelines for the program have been revised so that funding will match demand in Year Four.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent funds forward across future years of the grant, and the state will adjust future budget projections to align with the demand from educators.

Project Budget 11

Project Name: Kindergarten Entry Assessment

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year were in Personnel, Fringe Benefits, and Contractual. The Assessment Development position went unfilled for part of the year, creating the underspending in the related budget categories. In addition, the contract for the Kindergarten Entry Assessment development came in slightly under budget.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent funds forward across final year of the grant and submit a no-cost extension to spend remaining funds and conclude the work.

Project Budget 12

Project Name: Unified Data System

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

DECAL was able to utilize other funding sources to cover some of the contractual costs initially planned for in Year Three. Overspending on personnel and fringe benefits was due to unanticipated cost of living adjustments and mandatory benefit cost increases for all state employees.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent contractual funds forward across final year of the grant and submit a no-cost extension to spend remaining funds and conclude the work.

Project Budget 13

Project Name: _____

***GEORGIA'S RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 12 PROJECTS.
PAGES 89-105 HAVE BEEN DELETED.***

RTT-ELC Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$468,848.00	\$1,210,967.00	\$1,312,618.00	\$0.00	\$2,992,433.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$258,788.15	\$712,384.00	\$798,263.00	\$0.00	\$1,769,435.15
3. Travel	\$8,676.00	\$116,542.00	\$114,068.00	\$0.00	\$239,286.00
4. Equipment	\$66,642.00	\$10,874.00	\$1,411.00	\$0.00	\$78,927.00
5. Supplies	\$6,210.00	\$8,196.00	\$10,002.00	\$0.00	\$24,408.00
6. Contractual	\$619,137.00	\$2,453,134.00	\$4,258,692.00	\$0.00	\$7,330,963.00
7. Training Stipends	\$746,300.00	\$950,951.00	\$630,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,327,251.00
8. Other	\$4,371.00	\$18,454.00	\$15,872.00	\$0.00	\$38,697.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$2,178,972.15	\$5,481,502.00	\$7,140,926.00	\$0.00	\$14,801,400.15
10. Indirect Costs*	\$87,477.00	\$123,850.00	\$139,523.00	\$0.00	\$350,850.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$166,167.00	\$3,275,186.00	\$8,261,821.00	\$0.00	\$11,703,174.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$21,478.00	\$101,938.00	\$66,341.00	\$0.00	\$189,757.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$2,454,094.15	\$8,982,476.00	\$15,608,611.00	\$0.00	\$27,045,181.15
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$9,083,568.00	\$8,530,740.00	\$4,771,175.00	\$0.00	\$22,385,483.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$11,537,662.15	\$17,513,216.00	\$20,379,786.00	\$0.00	\$49,430,664.15

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 1 - Grant Management: Oversee the Early Learning Challenge agenda

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$157,733.00	\$172,441.00	\$209,787.00	\$0.00	\$539,961.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$91,408.15	\$103,637.00	\$131,431.00	\$0.00	\$326,476.15
3. Travel	\$2,206.00	\$8,020.00	\$6,676.00	\$0.00	\$16,902.00
4. Equipment	\$3,110.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,110.00
5. Supplies	\$492.00	\$924.00	\$420.00	\$0.00	\$1,836.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$151.00	\$893.00	\$0.00	\$1,044.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$151.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$151.00
8. Other	\$1,946.00	\$1,396.00	\$404.00	\$0.00	\$3,746.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$256,895.15	\$286,720.00	\$349,611.00	\$0.00	\$893,226.15
10. Indirect Costs*	\$16,086.00	\$23,600.00	\$17,388.00	\$0.00	\$57,074.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$21,478.00	\$101,938.00	\$66,341.00	\$0.00	\$189,757.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$294,459.15	\$412,258.00	\$433,340.00	\$0.00	\$1,140,057.15
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$65,672.00	\$82,560.00	\$83,120.00	\$0.00	\$231,352.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$360,131.15	\$494,818.00	\$516,460.00	\$0.00	\$1,371,409.15

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 2 - Early Education Empowerment Zones: Identify four empowerment zones for additional services for children with high needs and improve ELD infrastructure and quality in those areas

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$57,132.00	\$260,200.00	\$285,452.00	\$0.00	\$602,784.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$30,927.00	\$158,161.00	\$177,050.00	\$0.00	\$366,138.00
3. Travel	\$1,838.00	\$27,035.00	\$37,375.00	\$0.00	\$66,248.00
4. Equipment	\$14,638.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,638.00
5. Supplies	\$1,490.00	\$1,893.00	\$3,751.00	\$0.00	\$7,134.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$364.00	\$405.00	\$0.00	\$769.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$364.00	\$5,531.00	\$2,448.00	\$0.00	\$8,343.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$106,389.00	\$453,184.00	\$506,481.00	\$0.00	\$1,066,054.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$13,442.00	\$25,420.00	\$34,944.00	\$0.00	\$73,806.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$119,831.00	\$478,604.00	\$541,425.00	\$0.00	\$1,139,860.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$119,831.00	\$478,604.00	\$541,425.00	\$0.00	\$1,139,860.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 3 - Quality Rated Access and Availability: Revise Quality Rated Standards and create new incentives for providers to raise quality and parents to choose quality

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$56,391.00	\$422,147.00	\$482,466.00	\$0.00	\$961,004.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$33,508.00	\$257,732.00	\$299,761.00	\$0.00	\$591,001.00
3. Travel	\$2,844.00	\$66,984.00	\$60,228.00	\$0.00	\$130,056.00
4. Equipment	\$20,026.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,026.00
5. Supplies	\$1,475.00	\$1,632.00	\$3,668.00	\$0.00	\$6,775.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$1,307.00	\$460,417.00	\$0.00	\$461,724.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$1,217.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,217.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$115,461.00	\$749,802.00	\$1,306,540.00	\$0.00	\$2,171,803.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$36,761.00	\$57,602.00	\$72,345.00	\$0.00	\$166,708.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$162,142.00	\$2,794,186.00	\$7,090,565.00	\$0.00	\$10,046,893.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$314,364.00	\$3,601,590.00	\$8,469,450.00	\$0.00	\$12,385,404.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$5,756,886.00	\$4,765,188.00	\$1,419,478.00	\$0.00	\$11,941,552.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$6,071,250.00	\$8,366,778.00	\$9,888,928.00	\$0.00	\$24,326,956.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Quality Rated Validation: Validate levels of quality and validate impact of Quality Rated on children's development and growth

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$27,407.00	\$34,470.00	\$38,740.00	\$0.00	\$100,617.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$15,543.00	\$20,457.00	\$23,562.00	\$0.00	\$59,562.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$992.00	\$172.00	\$0.00	\$1,164.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$90.00	\$1.00	\$90.00	\$0.00	\$181.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$440,218.00	\$1,071,970.00	\$0.00	\$1,512,188.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$92.00	\$0.00	\$427.00	\$0.00	\$519.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$43,132.00	\$496,138.00	\$1,134,961.00	\$0.00	\$1,674,231.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$3,490.00	\$2,539.00	\$3,490.00	\$0.00	\$9,519.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$46,622.00	\$498,677.00	\$1,138,451.00	\$0.00	\$1,683,750.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$2,216,790.00	\$1,636,476.00	\$1,636,476.00	\$0.00	\$5,489,742.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$2,263,412.00	\$2,135,153.00	\$2,774,927.00	\$0.00	\$7,173,492.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 5 - Promoting Early Learning Outcomes: Develop training and resources for all stakeholders in the tiers of the professional development hierarchy

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$58,406.00	\$21,962.00	\$27,701.00	\$0.00	\$108,069.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,391.00	\$9,889.00	\$17,378.00	\$0.00	\$53,658.00
3. Travel	\$954.00	\$1,993.00	\$401.00	\$0.00	\$3,348.00
4. Equipment	\$3,824.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,824.00
5. Supplies	\$1,660.00	\$2,295.00	\$820.00	\$0.00	\$4,775.00
6. Contractual	\$371,855.00	\$489,401.00	\$469,340.00	\$0.00	\$1,330,596.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$600.00	\$8,648.00	\$2,822.00	\$0.00	\$12,070.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$463,690.00	\$534,188.00	\$518,462.00	\$0.00	\$1,516,340.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$6,565.00	\$4,776.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,341.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$470,255.00	\$538,964.00	\$518,462.00	\$0.00	\$1,527,681.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$470,255.00	\$538,964.00	\$518,462.00	\$0.00	\$1,527,681.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - Comprehensive Assessment System: Identify a set of common child assessments with professional development and policy guidelines

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$9,281.00	\$13,375.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	\$42,656.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$9,281.00	\$13,375.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	\$42,656.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$9,281.00	\$13,375.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	\$42,656.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$18,489.00	\$29,798.00	\$29,798.00	\$0.00	\$78,085.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$27,770.00	\$43,173.00	\$49,798.00	\$0.00	\$120,741.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 7 - Statewide Family Engagement and Community Grants: Revise Quality Rated Family Engagement Standards, launch a GELDS awareness campaign targeting families, and award grants to communities to promote family engagement.

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$21,656.00	\$11,309.00	\$10,150.00	\$0.00	\$43,115.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$12,124.00	\$3,723.00	\$6,329.00	\$0.00	\$22,176.00
3. Travel	\$101.00	\$30.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$131.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$75.00	\$496.00	\$80.00	\$0.00	\$651.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$10,200.00	\$5,714.00	\$0.00	\$15,914.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$152.00	\$2,524.00	\$2,714.00	\$0.00	\$5,390.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$34,108.00	\$28,282.00	\$24,987.00	\$0.00	\$87,377.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$2,273.00	\$826.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,099.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$210,000.00	\$0.00	\$210,000.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$36,381.00	\$29,108.00	\$234,987.00	\$0.00	\$300,476.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$600,000.00	\$600,000.00	\$400,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,600,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$636,381.00	\$629,108.00	\$634,987.00	\$0.00	\$1,900,476.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 8 - Center-based Home Visitation and FFN Care

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$8,953.00	\$8,376.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$17,329.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$5,047.00	\$2,610.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,657.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$14,000.00	\$10,986.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$24,986.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$1,042.00	\$826.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,868.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$4,025.00	\$481,000.00	\$961,256.00	\$0.00	\$1,446,281.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$19,067.00	\$492,812.00	\$961,256.00	\$0.00	\$1,473,135.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$150,000.00	\$300,000.00	\$0.00	\$450,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$19,067.00	\$642,812.00	\$1,261,256.00	\$0.00	\$1,923,135.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 9 - Workforce Knowledge and Competencies: Revise Georgia's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and increase articulation between postsecondary institutions offering programs of study in ECE

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$82,424.00	\$82,424.00	\$0.00	\$164,848.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$49,185.00	\$49,185.00	\$0.00	\$98,370.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$9,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,200.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$500.00	\$120.00	\$0.00	\$620.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$7,300.00	\$13,569.00	\$0.00	\$20,869.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,744.00	\$0.00	\$5,744.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$152,609.00	\$155,042.00	\$0.00	\$307,651.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$152,609.00	\$155,042.00	\$0.00	\$307,651.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$67,576.00	\$75,034.00	\$75,034.00	\$0.00	\$217,644.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$67,576.00	\$227,643.00	\$230,076.00	\$0.00	\$525,295.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 10 - Supporting Early Educators: Expand Scholarships and Incentives programs and implement the Georgia Professional Development Hierarchy.

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$24,364.00	\$64,970.00	\$65,783.00	\$0.00	\$155,117.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$14,517.00	\$39,475.00	\$40,893.00	\$0.00	\$94,885.00
3. Travel	\$733.00	\$6,377.00	\$4,906.00	\$0.00	\$12,016.00
4. Equipment	\$15,418.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,418.00
5. Supplies	\$175.00	\$9.00	\$679.00	\$0.00	\$863.00
6. Contractual	\$75,000.00	\$75,074.00	\$104,893.00	\$0.00	\$254,967.00
7. Training Stipends	\$746,300.00	\$950,800.00	\$630,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,327,100.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$238.00	\$1,313.00	\$0.00	\$1,551.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$876,507.00	\$1,136,943.00	\$848,467.00	\$0.00	\$2,861,917.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$4,200.00	\$4,313.00	\$5,929.00	\$0.00	\$14,442.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$880,707.00	\$1,141,256.00	\$854,396.00	\$0.00	\$2,876,359.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$578,353.00	\$486,549.00	\$0.00	\$1,064,902.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$880,707.00	\$1,719,609.00	\$1,340,945.00	\$0.00	\$3,941,261.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 11 - Kindergarten Entry Assessment: Augment Georgia's current formative assessment to implement a Kindergarten Entry Profile.

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$27,333.00	\$82,000.00	\$52,356.00	\$0.00	\$161,689.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$12,276.00	\$37,259.00	\$17,248.00	\$0.00	\$66,783.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,111.00	\$174.00	\$0.00	\$1,285.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$1,674.00	\$1,411.00	\$0.00	\$3,085.00
5. Supplies	\$120.00	\$319.00	\$294.00	\$0.00	\$733.00
6. Contractual	\$31,257.00	\$953,340.00	\$1,286,591.00	\$0.00	\$2,271,188.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$70,986.00	\$1,075,728.00	\$1,358,074.00	\$0.00	\$2,504,788.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$70,986.00	\$1,075,728.00	\$1,358,074.00	\$0.00	\$2,504,788.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$17,343.00	\$250,708.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$268,051.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$88,329.00	\$1,326,436.00	\$1,358,074.00	\$0.00	\$2,772,839.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 12 - Unified Data System: Expand the quantity and quality of data collected. Create entry points for providers to enter and use data. Facilitate greater family engagement by making data more readily available at the program and child level.

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$29,473.00	\$50,668.00	\$57,759.00	\$0.00	\$137,900.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$17,047.00	\$30,256.00	\$35,426.00	\$0.00	\$82,729.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$136.00	\$0.00	\$136.00
4. Equipment	\$9,626.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,626.00
5. Supplies	\$633.00	\$127.00	\$80.00	\$0.00	\$840.00
6. Contractual	\$131,744.00	\$462,404.00	\$824,900.00	\$0.00	\$1,419,048.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$92.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$92.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$188,523.00	\$543,547.00	\$918,301.00	\$0.00	\$1,650,371.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$3,618.00	\$3,948.00	\$5,427.00	\$0.00	\$12,993.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$192,141.00	\$547,495.00	\$923,728.00	\$0.00	\$1,663,364.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$340,812.00	\$362,623.00	\$340,720.00	\$0.00	\$1,044,155.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$532,953.00	\$910,118.00	\$1,264,448.00	\$0.00	\$2,707,519.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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