

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

New Jersey



JUNE 2015



Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Table of Contents

APR Cover Sheet	1
Certification	2
Executive Summary	3
Successful State Systems	9
Governance Structure	9
Stakeholder Involvement	9
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	10
Participating State Agencies.....	10
High-Quality, Accountable Programs	11
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	11
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)	14
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	15
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	18
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	20
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)	23
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	26
Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)	28
Promoting Early Learning Outcomes	29
Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)	29
Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application).....	31
Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)	32
Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application)	34
Early Childhood Education Workforce	37
Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application)	37
Measuring Outcomes and Progress	38
Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)	38
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)	40
Data Tables	41
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	41
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs	42
Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age	43
Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	44
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.....	45

Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	46
Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards.....	48
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State.....	49
Budget and Expenditure Tables	51
Budget Summary Table	51
Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Administration	53
Budget Table: Project 2 – Aligned Training and Professional Development	55
Budget Table: Project 3 – Grow NJ Kids Rollout and Incentives Administration	57
Budget Table: Project 4 – Independent Ratings for Program Quality Improvement	60
Budget Table: Project 5 – Validating the Grow NJ Kids Tiered QRIS	62
Budget Table: Project 6 – Family Engagement and Health Promotion	64
Budget Table: Project 7 – Public Outreach and Awareness	67
Budget Table: Project 8 – Data Systems	69
Budget Table: Project 9 – Preschool-Third Grade Initiatives	71
Budget Table: Project 10 – Kindergarten Entry Assessment	73
Budget Table: Project 11 – Standards	75

***Note:** All information in this document was prepared and submitted by the **Grantee** as their annual performance report (APR). For reference, the instructions and prompts from the approved APR form are included in italics throughout the document. Check marks in tables indicate the Grantee selected the option. A blank cells in a table indicates that the Grantee did not provide data or did not select the option.*



APR Cover Sheet

General Information

1. **PR/Award #:** S412A130049
2. **Grantee Name:** Office of the Governor, State of New Jersey
3. **Grantee Address:** PO Box 001
City: Trenton
State: New Jersey Zip: 08625
4. **Project Director Name:** Vincent J. Costanza
Title: Executive Director
Phone #: (609)777-0567 **Fax #:**
Email Address: vincent.costanza@doe.state.nj.us

Reporting Period Information

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

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): 07/01/2011 to 06/30/2016

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



Certification

The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

Yes No

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

Signed by Authorized Representative

Name: Ellen Wolock

Title: Director, Division of Early Childhood Education

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.

Background

In December 2013, New Jersey was awarded \$44.3 million to implement the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant to help improve access to high-quality early learning and development programs for thousands of high needs children throughout the state. The RTT-ELC grant incorporates a prenatal to age eight approach and reflects the shared leadership, collaboration, input, and long-term commitment across four core state agencies --Education (DOE), Children and Families (DCF), Health (DOH), and Human Services (DHS) --as well as the Commission on Higher Education and the New Jersey Council for Young Children (NJCYC), which includes our other public, private, state and local partners.

At the heart of the RTT-ELC is Grow NJ Kids (NJ's Quality Rating Improvement System), which provides a road map to achieving quality for early learning and care programs across settings. This system, which has been in development since 2005, has benefited from the work of stakeholder groups such as BUILD, the Shuman Fund for New Jersey, and the Nicholson Foundation. With grant funds, we are developing the rating system, providing incentives for participants, and validating the system to ensure that the levels are associated with positive outcomes for children.

Since no quality improvement initiative is complete without a rigorous and rational system of supports, we have created a support structure that makes continuous improvement affordable and accessible. To this end, we have established a regional NJ Early Learning Training Academy (Academy), led by Rutgers University, Center for Effective School Practices, to align early childhood workforce preparation. Of the many responsibilities for the Academy, one notable focus is the extensive training and supports that focus on infant and young child mental health and social-emotional development. In fact, the mental health focus extends throughout the grant as family engagement initiatives are specifically designed to address the impacts of toxic stress and prevent many stress factors by helping families and caregivers access vital health services.

In addition, the grant will help us to address the success of children as well as the quality of programs through third grade. By implementing a kindergarten entry assessment system (NJKEA), now in year one of implementation, and building upon the preschool and kindergarten guidelines with the design and implementation of best-practice guidelines for 1st - 3rd grades, the grant will position New Jersey as a national leader in PreK-3rd grade practices.

In short, year one of the RTT-ELC grant has provided a blueprint for state and local entities on how to address the comprehensive needs of children and their families in an intentional manner throughout the great state of New Jersey.

What follows in the Executive Summary are brief descriptions that detail, year one Accomplishments, Lessons Learned, Challenges, and perhaps most importantly the Strategies to Address Challenges.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The cross agency RTT-ELC team has embarked on implementing the eleven projects that our federal partners have approved in New Jersey's Scope of Work (SOW). After one year of implementation, the majority of tasks

within each of the projects have been completed within the timeframes approved in the SOW. Among the various activities and tasks, the following three initiatives stand out as accomplishments.

Project 2: Aligned Training and Professional Development

In September, DOE entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Rutgers University, Center for Effective School Practices (CESP), which is a public institution of higher education, to participate in the activities associated with New Jersey's Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant. The NJ Early Learning Training Academy (Academy) currently has three regional locations (North, Central, and South) to ensure easier access to core and supplemental trainings for early learning and development providers across sectors.

The Academy has begun to provide targeted training opportunities that reflect the components of Grow NJ Kids. The initial focus of the Academy is on Child Care, Family Child Care, Early Head Start/Head Start, and Preschool settings. However, the long-range vision for this unified approach to workforce development will be to offer shared training opportunities across sectors to include Home Visiting, Family Outreach Workers, and other community programs that have a focus on families from pregnancy/infancy to age eight.

The purpose of the Training Academy is to create a cadre of certified and endorsed trainers who are experts in the components of Grow NJ Kids as follows:

Health and Safety: National Health and Safety Standards, Preventive Health Measures

Curriculum and Learning Environment: Learning Standards, Curriculum (High Scope, Creative Curriculum, Tools of the Mind), Assessment (Performance Based Assessment, Developmental and Behavioral Screening), Quality Measures (Infant Toddler Environment Rating Scale, Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale, Classroom Assessment Scoring System)

Family and Community Engagement: Strengthening Families or equivalent, Guidelines for Home Visiting

Workforce Development: NJ Core Competency Framework and Career Lattice, Teacher Evaluation, Infant and Young Child Mental Health Endorsement, Pyramid Model, Cultural Competence, Supporting English language learners, Supporting infants and young children with disabilities

Administration and Management: Program Administration Scale, Data collection and analysis

Throughout the first two years of the grant, 2014 and 2015, Academy staff will receive training in each component. Starting in 2015, the Academy staff will use a Train the Trainer model to equip current technical assistance staff in each early care and education setting with the tools they need to work within their settings. These "Quality Improvement Specialists" (QIS) will provide support both in Professional Learning Communities and at the program site.

*The QIS will consist of:

- Master teachers from the "former" Abbott preschool programs in school and provider sites
- Education Coordinators and teams in Early Head Start and Head Start
- Child Care Resource and Referral Agency staff (working with center-based and family-based child care)

In the subsequent years, the Training Academy will provide Professional Development opportunities across early childhood systems/programs (e.g., Home Visiting, State Preschool, Child Care, Early Head Start, Head Start). Initial training of the QIS will also include coaching and reflective practice.

Project 3: GNJK Rollout and Incentives Administration

At the heart of New Jersey's RTT-ELC work is Grow NJ Kids. Grow NJ Kids provides a road map to achieving quality for early learning and care programs across various settings and auspices (e.g., Head Start and state-funded preschool) by providing a system of carefully sequenced levels of evidence-based practices in health, family and community engagement, early learning and administration. Star ratings will help parents make informed decisions about their infant or young child's care and education and will ultimately impact 83,000 infants and young children (in 1,788 sites). Incentives like classroom enhancements and scholarships as well as training targeted to each component of Grow NJ Kids (offered through the Academy) will help sites progress through the levels.

Given the role that Grow NJ Kids has within the RTT-ELC grant and the timeline demonstrating NJ's commitment to a TQRIS, the following represent significant accomplishments for Grow NJ Kids.

To date, we have 392 programs enrolled in the Grow NJ Kids as well as an additional 36 family child-care providers who are piloting a version of the family child-care tool with the assistance of the philanthropic community. Given that our year one targets as approved in the SOW included the recruitment of 387 center based sites and 30 family care sites throughout the state, the work of the Grow NJ Kids team, which encapsulated the cross-agency collaboration, represents a significant accomplishment. Child-care providers already know the importance of high quality early care and education and now, Grow NJ Kids is providing better access to the tools - all free of charge - to help programs establish a system of continuous improvements.

This first year of implementing Grow NJ Kids has served as an assessment tool for programs to engage in reflective practices, providing a clear roadmap for improving quality, and a way for programs to market higher quality child-care offerings.

To figure out which curriculum to use, providers attended a curriculum showcase. This event, which occurred in the fall, drew 140 participants in one region alone. Program administrators also attended a directors' orientation offered regionally throughout the state. During the orientation, participants each received USB drives with the Grow NJ Kids Tool preloaded, as well as an official participation certificate with the State seal to hang in their center.

Project 10: Kindergarten Entry Assessment (NJKEA)

Beginning in July of 2014, a total of two hundred teachers and ninety-four district level administrators across twenty-five districts, were trained in Teaching Strategies GOLD (GOLD), a rigorous and appropriate performance-based assessment instrument. During the first seven weeks of kindergarten, teachers collected evidence of children's performance across three of the nine Teaching Strategies Gold domains including, social emotional, literacy, and mathematics, for the purpose of assigning a score along a continuum that ranges from "Not Yet to 9." Once teachers made ratings for each child at the end of the seven-week period, teachers, administrators, and DOE representatives were able to view scores of individual children as well as aggregate scores across all districts within each learning domain. As a way to inform instruction and monitor goal setting through the year, all teachers are continuing to use GOLD throughout the entire school year.

Prior to making the initial rating of children's performance at entry, teachers completed a reliability assessment that added credence to the accuracy of teacher ratings. One Technical Assistance Visit was made by Teaching Strategies within the first seven weeks, as well as three live webinars, and one teacher/administrator survey occurring at the end of the seven-week period to gauge the level of implementation. As a strategy to support best practices in the kindergarten year, teachers participating in NJKEA also attended the Kindergarten

Seminars, which is a five day regional series that began in late October of 2014 and ends in April of 2015. This exciting and novel approach to supporting NJKEA implementation has proved fruitful as year one of implementation has revolved around best practices in the kindergarten year rather than merely another assessment initiative.

The seminars provide participants with an introduction to key features of New Jersey's Kindergarten Implementation Guidelines and the NJKEA initiative. The series includes sessions to support teachers in organizing classroom environments and schedules, implementing developmentally appropriate practices, applying effective teaching strategies that support children's development and learning, incorporating the common core standards and weaving in the GOLD assessment cycle throughout. Finally, all participants will use the instrument throughout the kindergarten year as a formative assessment tool.

While it is true that teachers often complete many assessments within districts, it is rare that teachers complete assessments that include the full range of developmental learning domains that recognize the complexity of young children, such as Social & Emotional Development, Cognition, and Approaches to Learning domains.

LESSONS LEARNED

New Jersey entered this work with a structure in place that created the foundation to accomplish the work approved by our federal partners in the SOW. The Interdepartmental Planning Group (IPG) is the primary implementation arm for programs and policies affecting young children in the state. It includes the administrators (under the commissioners) from each of the state's departments with oversight of programs and services related to children from prenatal to age eight, and other relevant agencies. This group considers the feasibility of program and policy recommendations, makes plans for implementation, presents those plans to the various agency commissioners, and ultimately carries out the plans while working in close collaboration with all other relevant state organizations and agencies. Although New Jersey enters the RTT-ELC work in round three, we have been working at many of the projects for some time, because of this IPG structure (e.g., NJKEA & GNJK). What is clear is that the work outlined in RTT-ELC would not have been possible without the strength of the cross-agency relationship, made manifest in the work of the IPG.

In addition to the relationship of the agency partners, making an early commitment to human capital by filling positions required in the grant as soon as possible has been essential. For instance, the success in our year one rollout of Grow NJ Kids is certainly related to the attention and focus of our coordinator, who is housed at DHS. It is hard to imagine the administration of such an initiative without someone dedicated to the rollout and training needed for the work to be successful.

Lastly, an important lesson learned was the attention needed for sustainability issues early in the life of the grant. It is important to all partners, (agency partners and beyond) that we are not merely "four-year friends." The work of the grant is extensive and needs significant planning to be sustained. Although the entire sustainability picture is not yet complete, we have instituted a plan to ensure that the work within the grant will continue for years to come. Our broad sustainability timeline looks as follows:

Year	Activity
1	Gather information and look to other states
2	Form workgroup and develop plan
3	Communicate plan
4	Prepare for implementation

Although we acknowledge that the sustainability work will most likely not happen in the linear fashion detailed above, we believe this provides a framework to move forward. What is more, the technical support that we have received from our federal partners and technical assistance providers has not only informed our thinking in this area, but also linked us to successful work in other states and even led to the addition of activities in our SOW to assist in our sustainability goals.

While there have been many lessons learned during the first twelve months of implementation, a focus on cross-agency relations, a determination to get the “right people on the bus” by focusing on human capital and filling positions with quality individuals quickly, and an immediate effort to plan for sustainability, have produced the biggest lessons learned.

CHALLENGES

New Jersey has faced three major challenges during the first year of implementation. The first challenge stems from implementation of Project 8: Data Systems. We are currently behind in our SOW for this project due to a lack of clarity on where the project would be housed.

The second major challenge arose from difficulties getting Memoranda of Understandings (MOUs) signed with our higher education partners, especially the MOU that outlined the work of the Training Academy. Currently, we have two of four MOUs signed with our higher education partners and anticipate the remaining MOUs to be fully executed in the early part of year two.

Lastly, we are currently under spending for incentives. Within the RTT-ELC, New Jersey planned to provide professional development with embedded, onsite supports for Grow NJ Kids providers as well as the following incentives:

- Quality Enhancement Funds - Sites may use funding to purchase items such as classroom materials, equipment, substitutes, or other items that do not supplant existing contracts with state.
- Scholarships for Advancing Credentials - Early childhood educators will be eligible for funding assistance to continue their education in the areas of early learning and development.

Grow NJ Kids providers will be eligible to apply for quality enhancement funds at any of the five levels, including Level 1, as long as their request is tied to the program's quality improvement plan. Over the four-year grant period, New Jersey has allocated just over \$2.5 million of RTT-ELC funds for these quality enhancements. While providers now have access to free and high quality professional development offered through the Academy, providers need support with accessing the full breath of incentives. Although New Jersey is not alone in this challenge, providing support to spent incentives dollars will be a focus of year two.

STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES

The strategies to address the three challenges detailed above draw from the approaches detailed in our lessons learned. Namely, we have looked to personnel and the strength of our IPG relationship to address pitfalls associated with implementing the grant.

Leveraging a personnel strategy has assisted with the data project as well as incentives administration. Although implementing Project 8: Data Systems has been a challenge during the first year of implementation, we worked closely with state OIT to build the specs for our data system. They have walked us through our research questions to ensure we will get the most desirable system. These meetings, initially occurring on a bi-weekly basis helped to keep the project moving. However, the biggest strategy with this challenge is bringing in a full-

time project manager to focus on the approved SOW and cross-agency collaboration necessary to ensure success. We hired a full time project manager in January 2015 who is focusing exclusively on this project.

Furthermore, as a strategy to address the delay in incentives spending, a full time incentives manager has been hired by DHS to manage the scholarship and program improvement incentives outlined in Grow NJ Kids.

Lastly, while MOUs are necessary with higher education to conduct various aspects of the RTT-ELC work, getting the MOUs fully executed has taken longer than anticipated in some instances. The strategy to address this concern is to work closely with the IPG, leverage services available through each agency until the documents are signed, which will allow the work to begin in earnest. For example, each agency contributed staff to assist with Grow NJ Kids orientation, which will now be offered through the Academy.

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).

MANAGEMENT OF THE GRANT:

New Jersey's RTT-ELC grant incorporates a prenatal to age eight approach and reflects the shared leadership, collaboration, input, and long-term commitment across four core state agencies --Education (DOE), Children and Families (DCF), Health (DOH), and Human Services (DHS) --and the New Jersey Council for Young Children (NJCYC) that includes our other public, private, state, and local partners. The partners have created a vision, which is the inspiration for a blueprint that state and local entities can use to address the comprehensive needs of children and their families in an intentional manner throughout New Jersey.

Furthermore, the implementation and management of this blueprint is the primary responsibility of the RTT-ELC Executive Director who essentially serves the role of grant “conductor.” This principal role of the Executive Director is to “hear” the work across agencies and make connections amongst the eleven RTT-ELC projects to ensure that responsible parties are meeting time-lines, but more importantly that the work across agencies is implemented in a meaningful manner and useful to the lives of practitioners, families, and children.

GOVERNANCE:

As submitted in the RTT-ELC grant application, Executive Order 77 - In 2011, Governor Chris Christie established the Early Learning Commission (ELC), to convene the four commissioners of DOE, DCF, DOH, DHS and the chair of the NJCYC to promote the coordination of programs and funding. The Executive Order also led to the creation of the Interdepartmental Planning Group (IPG), comprised of the administrators and senior staff from the four state agencies, whose role is to consider the NJCYC's recommendations, make plans for implementation, and carry out the plans within the RTT-ELC grant.

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.

STAKEHOLDER PROGRESS

In order to support the implementation of RTT-ELC, the IPG established broad-based involvement of stakeholders (e.g., higher education partners and faith-based community). Such a diverse coalition is evidenced by the diverse listings of presentations delivered to various constituencies throughout the state during the first year of the grant. For instance, presentations were scheduled with major stakeholder groups, such as the New Jersey Association for the Education of Young Children, New Jersey Association of School Administrators, Public

School Superintendents' Roundtables, LEA Dyslexia Working Group, Early Childhood Supervisors, New Jersey Head Start Association, New Jersey Presidents' Council, the New Jersey Faith-Based Advisory Council as well as various other stakeholder groups. In the second year of implementation, the RTT-ELC team plans to implement a communication plan that will be aimed at delivering regular updates on the progress of the RTT-ELC implementation. The major communication tools will include:

- RTT-ELC regularly scheduled newsletters that will be designed to provide project updates to stakeholders throughout that state and country
- Continued development of an RTT-ELC website.

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

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

The passage of the new Child Care & Development Block Grant (CCDBG), on November 17, 2014, will have a large impact on our state, as it is a key source of funding for high-quality child care. While we expect CCDBG to benefit the child care community, work continues with all of the state agencies to gauge the impact of updates to the law.

Participating State Agencies

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

No changes.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

During the current year, has the State made progress in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include —?

(1) Early Learning & Development Standards	
Yes or No	Yes
Early Learning & Development Standards that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System	
Yes or No	Yes
A Comprehensive Assessment System that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications	
Yes or No	Yes
Early Childhood Educator qualifications that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

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

(4) Family engagement strategies	
Yes or No	Yes
Family engagement strategies that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

(5) Health promotion practices	
Yes or No	Yes
Health promotion practices that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

(6) Effective data practices	
Yes or No	Yes
Effective data practices that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
<i>Center-based</i>	✓
<i>Family Child Care</i>	✓

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

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

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

As mentioned above, New Jersey has made significant progress in the first year of implementing Grow NJ Kids. To date, we have 392 programs enrolled in the Grow NJ Kids as well as an additional 36 family child-care providers who are piloting a version of the family child-care tool with the assistance of the philanthropic community.

New Jersey's strategy is to promote participation in Grow NJ Kids and to elevate program quality in early learning and development settings that serve high needs children and families; and create a system that provides families with access to affordable and high quality early learning and development programs.

By the end of the grant period, Grow NJ Kids will reach close to 40% (72,716 children) of the estimated population of children with high needs birth to five.

In order to reach the goal mentioned above by the end of the grant period, New Jersey will make Grow NJ Kids participation available to programs from the 21 counties across the state. Such practices were led by the Grow NJ Kids Coordinator during the first year of the grant and will continue throughout the life of the grant.

Furthermore, New Jersey will continue the marketing campaign based on strategies identified in the NJCYC's "More than Marketing: A New Jersey Study on Outreach to Underserved Populations, Ages Birth to Five" study and work to establish public/private partnerships to create a scholarship and capital improvement fund for Grow NJ Kids participants.

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.

To date, we have 392 programs enrolled in the Grow NJ Kids as well as an additional 36 family child-care providers who are piloting a version of the family child-care tool with the assistance of the philanthropic community. Given that our year one targets as approved in the SOW included the recruitment of 387 center based sites and 30 family care sites throughout the state, the work of the Grow NJ Kids team, which encapsulated the cross-agency collaboration, represents a significant accomplishment. Child-care providers already know the importance of high quality early care and education and now, Grow NJ Kids is providing better access to the tools - all free of charge - to help programs establish a system of continuous improvements.

This first year of implementation has provided an assessment tool to programs to engage in reflective practices using the tool to leverage conversations with Quality Improvement Specialists (QIS) and critically analyze program offerings. In addition, the tool has provided a clear roadmap for improving quality and a way for programs to market higher quality child-care offerings.

Furthermore, providers have been able to access a curriculum showcase to assist in making informed curricular decisions. This event, which occurred in the fall, drew 140 participants in one region alone. Program administrators have also attended a directors' orientation offered regionally throughout the state. During the orientation, participants each received USB drives with the Grow NJ Kids Tool preloaded, as well as an official participation certificate with the State seal to hang in their center.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	13	2.20%	132	22.10%	251	42.00%	370	62.00%	489	81.90%
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	9	330.00%	38	19.20%	76	38.40%	114	57.60%	152	76.80%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	0.00%	35	10.00%	70	20.00%	105	30.00%	140	40.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	26	1.10%	143	6.10%	260	11.10%	377	16.10%	494	21.10%
Other 1	-	0.00%	38	19.20%	76	38.40%	114	57.60%	152	76.80%
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs									
Other 2	1	1.80%	6	10.90%	11	20.00%	16	29.10%	21	38.20%
Describe:	Private Schools for the Disabled									
Other 3	-	0.00%	30	1.40%	80	3.80%	130	6.20%	180	8.60%
Describe:	Family Child Care Centers receiving CCDF funds									
Other 4	11	0.50%	54	2.40%	99	4.40%	144	6.40%	189	8.40%
Describe:	Other licensed center and family child care sites									

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

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs									
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	597	13	2.20%	597	159	26.60%			
Specify:	State-funded Preschool (former Abbott)								
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	150	9	330.00 %	150	40	26.60%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	350	-	0.00%	350	11	3.10%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	2,342	26	1.10%	2,342	268	11.44%			
Other 1	198	-	0.00%	198	8	4.00%			
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs								
Other 2	55	1	1.80%	55	1	1.80%			
Describe:	Private Schools for the Disabled								
Other 3	2,100	-	0.00%	2,100	36	1.71%			
Describe:	Family Child Care Centers receiving CCDF funds								
Other 4	2,258	11	0.50%	2,258	114	5.04%			
Describe:	Other licensed center and family child care sites								

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

Actuals						
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs						
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool						
Specify:						
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds						
Other 1						
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs					
Other 2						
Describe:	Private Schools for the Disabled					
Other 3						
Describe:	Family Child Care Centers receiving CCDF funds					
Other 4						
Describe:	Other licensed center and family child care sites					

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

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

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

* Numbers for these programs also include special education programs and related services to children with disabilities funded through IDEA Part B and 619 funds and special education state funds. To prevent duplication, these sites are not included in the count of IDEA Part B programs.

IDEA Part C Early Intervention Programs (EIP) are not included above because NJ does not provide Part C center-based specific settings. NJ early intervention services for eligible children and families are provided in "natural environments including home and community settings. However, Part C provider agencies and practitioners will receive training on Grow NJ Kids and the Birth to Three Standards.

All early learning programs funded by Title I of ESEA are included within the State Preschool Program.

Baseline data are estimated based on the state's current Grow NJ Kids pilot program.

The actual numbers of participating programs in Grow NJ Kids are duplicated because the majority of the programs enrolled in Grow NJ Kids fall into multiple program types.

Lastly, our baseline numbers were higher than provided in the grant application. The pilot programs ("test-drive" programs) were not fully identified at the time of the writing of the grant. Those numbers are now updated.

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.

In year two of the grant, the Grow NJ Kids team will target recruitment efforts towards the private schools for the disabled, Part B-619 programs, and other district programs. Recently, staff was hired to support the efforts of Part B-619 and private schools for the disabled. The Grow NJ Kids team will host recruitment webinars and use this as a strategy that will specifically target those programs. In addition, NJ was just awarded the Preschool Expansion Grant. The Grow NJ Kids team will work with those expansion districts to encourage their providers to participate in the program.

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

Has the State made progress during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that:

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

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

Although New Jersey has not conducted any of ratings of programs using Grow NJ Kids in the first year of implementing RTT-ELC, we have identified the university that will conduct the ratings and anticipate having a fully executed Memorandum of Understanding in place during the winter of 2015.

We know that this will be essential to our efforts of elevating quality. The ratings system will not only reflect a robust set of measures for validity and reliability, but also provide parents and families with accessible, transparent information about quality. Through the partnership with higher education, New Jersey will allocate over \$2 million toward the development and implementation of the rating system, which will include the following:

Inter-Rater Reliability

Grow NJ Kids will include a robust process for establishing and maintaining an inter-rater reliability.

- Infant Toddler Environmental Rating Scale-Revised, Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised, Classroom Assessment Scoring System (for infants/toddlers/preschool), and Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale will be part of the rating process.
- Administration in 50% of rooms at each site, in each age group, as appropriate.
- Necessary modifications to the Grow NJ Kids Rating Checklist.
- The selected university will identify Anchor Raters, who will be selected on the basis of their experience with and mastery of the program standards and rating tools, including being trained to reliability on each of the structured observation instruments.

- New raters begin with a process of guided practice, which includes lessons on developmentally appropriate practices, reviews of completed assessments, and simulated ratings using video clips of real situations.
- New raters must complete at least three “reliability visits,” in which both they and an Anchor Rater complete a full assessment. Over the course of the three visits, the new monitor takes on increasing responsibility for facilitating the visit (e.g. by the third visit, the new rater conducts the interview).
- After each reliability visit, new monitors debrief and review scoring with the Anchor Rater.
- New raters must complete at least three visits in which their assessment scores at greater than 85% reliability with the Anchor Rater.
- All raters - including Anchors - are monitored for reliability over time to prevent deviation. Each monitor undergoes a reliability check on an annual basis, and any scores lower than 85% require additional practice assessments before returning to the field.

Rating Cycle: Upon entering the Grow NJ Kids system, a program may choose to be assigned a rating of Level 1 (valid license or license exempt) or Level 2 (submission of self-assessment), or can apply to be rated at a Level 3, 4, or 5. Grow NJ Kids sites with Level 1 or 2 designations do not require validation by an outside rater. On-site ratings from the university conducting the ratings will occur for the top three levels --Levels 3, 4, and 5. Once assigned to Level 3 or above, programs must be re-rated a minimum of once every three years. The rating assessment will be free of charge; however, assessments will be limited to one free assessment per year.

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

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

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

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
5

How many programs moved up or down at least one level within the TQRIS over the last fiscal year?

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Although New Jersey has not conducted any ratings of programs using Grow NJ Kids in the first year of implementing RTT-ELC, we have identified the University that will conduct the ratings and anticipate having a fully executed Memorandum of Understanding in place during the winter of 2015.

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

High-Quality Benchmarks at the Highest Level(s) of the TQRIS	
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet State preschool standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or there is a reciprocal agreement between State preschool and the TQRIS)	Yes
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet Federal Head Start Performance Standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, there is a reciprocal agreement between Head Start and the TQRIS, or there is an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet national accreditation standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)	Yes
Early Learning and Development Standards	Yes
A Comprehensive Assessment System	Yes
Early Childhood Educator qualifications	Yes
Family engagement strategies	Yes
Health promotion practices	Yes
Effective data practices	Yes
Program quality assessments	Yes

Please provide more detail on your development of high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS by the end of the grant period.

Grow NJ Kids standards reflect high expectations for program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children.

- First, the standards incorporate NJ's recently revised licensing standards at Level 1. Although this equates to the lowest level of quality in Grow NJ Kids, with New Jersey's high national ranking for licensing standards, programs enter Grow NJ Kids with a strong base.
- Second, Grow NJ Kids standards have been cross walked with national models for excellence found in the National Association for the Education of Young Children accreditation standards, National Association of Family Child Care Accreditation, National Early Childhood Program Accreditation, and Head Start performance standards [The Grow NJ Kids tool identifies the related national association standards in a column within each Grow NJ Kids standard. While there is significant alignment, in most cases the upper levels of Grow NJ Kids exceed the national standards
- Third, within each level of the Grow NJ Kids instrument, NJ incorporates five nationally recognized areas of quality standards--early learning standards, family and community engagement, health and safety standards, workforce qualifications, and program management.
- Fourth, the Grow NJ Kids tool and rating process is based on NJ's highly effective State Preschool Program, the Head Start Performance Standards, and the Massachusetts Tiered QRIS.
- *Finally*, Grow NJ Kids is grounded in the national research on the association of high-quality early childhood education with positive outcomes for young children.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	56	473	912	1,351	1,790	428			
Number of Programs in Tier 1	14	118	221	279	332	376			
Number of Programs in Tier 2	14	118	221	279	335	52			
Number of Programs in Tier 3	22	189	376	635	899	0			
Number of Programs in Tier 4	3	24	47	79	113	0			
Number of Programs in Tier 5	3	24	47	79	111	0			

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.

The baseline numbers were estimated with the idea that programs would have gone through the rating process. While New Jersey has not conducted any ratings of programs using Grow NJ Kids in the first year of implementing RTT-ELC, we have identified the University that will conduct the ratings and anticipate having a fully executed Memorandum of Understanding in place during the winter of 2015. Although the formal rating process has not officially started, 52 programs enrolled in the pilot have completed the self-assessment and quality improvement phase and are currently working on the goals identified in their plans. All 428 programs have been verified to have a valid license through DCF Office of Licensing or have met comparable standards for license exempt and registered programs (DOE programs).

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.

Programs in the pilot are working on implementing their quality improvement plans and are preparing to go through the rating process. Furthermore, the Grow NJ Kids team is making efforts to provide the Directors Orientation Training in an online format to encourage providers/programs to participate in a more timely fashion. The online training will move participants into Tier 2 faster. As the ratings process currently works, upon entry to the system a program may choose to be assigned a rating of Level 1 (valid license or license exempt) or Level 2 (submission of self-assessment), or can apply to be rated at a Level 3, 4, or 5.

Recently, DHS hired the Incentives Coordinator and she has immediately worked on clarifying policies and procedures that participants need to follow when applying for incentives. The work of the Incentives Manager will allow programs to move through tier 2 at a much faster pace, hence ensuring that we meet our targets by the end of the grant period.

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

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

Targets										
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	660	1.40%	6,240	13.50%	12,060	26.10%	19,800	42.90%	26,940	58.30%
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	240	1.90%	1,440	11.60%	2,496	20.10%	3,744	30.10%	5,376	43.20%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	-	0.00%	352	3.80%	1,152	12.50%	1,696	18.40%	1,856	20.20%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	38	0.20%	286	1.30%	495	2.20%	999	4.50%	1,620	7.30%
Other 1	-	0.00%	1,260	14.60%	2,460	28.40%	4,380	50.60%	4,620	53.40%
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs									

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

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	46,177	660	1.40%						
Specify:	State-Funded Preschool Programs								
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	12,447	240	1.90%						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	9,209	-	0.00%						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	-	0.00%						
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	22,186	38	0.20%						
Other 1	8,656	-	0.00%						
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs								

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

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

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

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

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

All early learning programs funded by Title I of ESEA are included within the State Preschool Program.

Star levels 3, 4, and 5 are included as "top tiers." As such, NJ has not identified programs in "top tiers" as ratings have not yet been conducted. Although New Jersey has not conducted any ratings of programs using Grow NJ Kids in the first year of implementing RTT-ELC, we have identified the University that will conduct the ratings and anticipate having a fully executed Memorandum of Understanding in place during the winter of 2015.

Baseline data are estimated based on the state's current QRIS pilot.

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

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

We anticipate the rating process commencing in March of 2015 and continuing in earnest throughout the life of the grant. This timeline will allow NJ to meet all grant targets by the end of the grant period.

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.

The university that will conduct the validation study has been identified and we anticipate having a fully executed MOU during the winter of 2015. Although we do not have a finalized plan, we anticipate the validation study beginning in earnest during the fall of 2015.

New Jersey seeks to validate Grow NJ Kids by a) validating whether the levels in the system accurately reflect differential levels of program quality and b) assessing the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. This validation will identify which aspects of Grow NJ Kids are effective at improving quality and the associated impact of quality improvements on children.

DOE will develop an MOU for an independent evaluator to design and implement the multi-faceted evaluation. The university conducting the validation study will address the following requirements to design a multi-year evaluation:

Requirements for a successful validation

1. Ensures that the sampling is representative and has sufficient power to detect differences across and among subgroups in quality practices and in child learning as a result of Grow NJ Kids, especially for children at risk.
2. Uses child assessments designed to measure learning across domains that are relevant to New Jersey's early learning and development standards, are psychometrically valid, proven to discriminate program effects in similar studies, and appropriate for the age range of birth to five.
3. Uses measures of classroom and family child care quality that are relevant to the Grow NJ Kids indicators (ITERS-R, ECERS-R, FCCRS, CLASS), are psychometrically valid, proven to predict child learning, and appropriate for the settings and age-ranges of Grow NJ Kids (birth to five, child care centers, preschools, Head Start, Early Head Start and family child care homes).
4. Ensures implementation of effective procedures for tracking children and families longitudinally, and will extract relevant child data from NJ SMART, the state's longitudinal data system.
5. Produces timely reports and uses cost-effective procedures using the state's MOU process.

Study Design and Procedures

Although the details of the plan will be determined by the university in consultation with stakeholders, the overall design has been established. Specifically, the study design addresses children with high needs by:

- Measuring the effectiveness of Grow NJ Kids disaggregated by each high needs/special population and age group and informing improvements to the system.

- Measuring the impact of participation in Grow NJ Kids on each program type and informing improvements in the system, across settings.

The following questions will be addressed:

1. *Does obtaining a higher quality level result in greater child growth and school readiness and do these results apply to all subgroups of children?*
2. *Are the quality indicators being used in Grow NJ Kids, efficient and non-duplicative? Do they accurately reflect differential levels of program quality?*
3. *Is the technical assistance provided effective in improving quality and moving sites to higher levels?*
4. *Is New Jersey's Early Learning Improvement Consortium using the rating protocol reliably?*
5. *What is the impact of incentives?*
6. *What are family perspectives on the process and are the ratings influencing their decision making?*
7. *Are providers satisfied with the supports that they are receiving?*

Annual reports will provide information regarding patterns in the type and characteristics of sites that opt to be rated or not, including but not limited to, the following: auspice and program type, size of program, geographic location, qualifications of leadership and staff, administrative practices and cost data at the program level.

Instrumentation

The final selection of instruments will be determined in consultation with the university, but will include the following:

Child and family characteristics

A survey of child and family characteristics; for example, race and ethnicity, age of child and parent, child gender, education level of parents, home language(s), family income, work status, marital status, household density, medical home, insurance, education-related family routines and home environment.

Child outcome measures

Direct assessments and early childhood educator interviews (e.g. standardized questionnaires on social development) will be administered to determine child growth and development. Domains assessed will mirror those included in the existing New Jersey Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards and in the New Jersey Birth to Three Early Learning Standards. It is likely that a battery of assessment tools (predictive of later development) will be adopted for each age level. It will be expected that the contractor use the New Jersey Kindergarten Entry Assessment as one outcome measure when it is implemented.

Administrative practices

At the center level, early learning and development program administrative practices and site characteristics will be documented via interviews with the site administrators.

Classroom quality

The quality of the participating programs will be assessed using the same instruments as those used for Grow NJ Kids; namely, the ITERS-R, ECERS-3, FCCERS, and CLASS. The purpose for this is to establish reliability of New Jersey's Early Learning Improvement Consortium and to capture the overall impact of participation in the system.

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

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

Focused Investment Areas

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

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

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

The current alignment of standards has occurred primarily in three subcommittees of the New Jersey Council for Young Children during year one of the RTT-ELC implementation. Through the work of the Workforce Subcommittee, a draft document of the Core Knowledge Competencies Framework (CKC) was completed and put to bid for an editor. The Core Knowledge Areas and Competency Levels, Professional Standards for Adults Working with Young Children Birth through Age Eight & In Afterschool Programs, hereafter referred to as the **Core Knowledge and Competencies**, is based on the underlying premises that (a) the developmental and learning needs of young children are qualitatively different from those of older children and (b) all children, including those with special health and development needs learn best in environments where:

- Adults recognize and understand the need for the development of a relationship that will be inclusive of the child's family.
- Learning opportunities are meaningful and relevant
- Children can construct their knowledge of the world through activities and interactions with others
- Children's individual needs are reflected, recognized, and addressed in accordance with the culture of the children and their families
- Health and safety is an integral component of the child care and educational program activities and learning

The Family Engagement Subcommittee produced a draft of the "Family Engagement Practices that Help Children Thrive." The standards outline the following recommended practices:

- Build strong relationships to ensure emotional and intellectual development. Gain access to resources and services that promote infant, child and family well-being
- Foster educational success at home and school
- Encourage lifelong learning opportunities with families, caregivers and children
- Practice Self-care

The *Standards Subcommittee* has produced a draft alignment document. Standards committee is set to have an alignment document that links or connections provides both horizontal and vertical alignment, as represented below:

- Horizontal Alignment
 - Core competencies
 - Assessment
 - Curriculum
- Vertical Alignment
 - Pre-K guidelines
 - K-12 guidelines
 - Common Core Standard

This particular subcommittee has produced a wide array of stakeholders throughout the state that reflect many levels of the early care and education system. The variety of perspectives creates the space for the vertical and horizontal articulation that will allow these standards to be implemented in a manner that is useful to practitioners. See below for a list of the stakeholders.

Standards Subcommittee Stakeholders

NJCYC - Mercer and Middlesex County Offices of Education
NJCYC - CITE
Early Childhood Consultant
NJDOE - Standards Director
Red Bank Borough Schools - PreK Nurse
Red Bank Borough Schools - PreK Master Teacher
William Paterson University - Early Childhood Professor
Kean University - Professor
Early Childhood Consultant
Division of Children and Families - Social Worker
Division of Children and Families - Social Worker
ACNJ - Policy Analyst
NJEIS Coordinator- CSPD Coordinator
NJ Coalition for Inclusive Education -President and CEO
Waterfront Montessori
Waterfront Montessori
RTTT Early Learning Challenge Grant - Executive Director
NJ Council for Young Children - Executive Director
Principal - East Windsor
Teacher - MCSSSD
Principal - MCSSSD
Curriculum Coordinator
The Westmont Montessori School - Morris County

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

Has the State made progress in:

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

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

New Jersey promotes health standards across all five levels of the Tiered QRIS (*corresponds with Grow NJ Kids Category 1: Safe, Healthy Learning Environments*) that are adapted from Stepping Stones: Caring for Our Children. Grow NJ Kids is aligned with nationally accepted practices that promote high quality learning within a safe and healthy environment. Participating sites must meet standards for the physical environment, i.e., furnishings and classroom conditions; and offer age-appropriate activities/services that promote healthy eating habits, physical activity and oral health, based on the developmental abilities and capacities of the children. Grow NJ Kids establishes a common set of health standards for developmental, behavioral, and sensory screening, referral, and follow up; and health literacy is also addressed throughout the levels and categories.

Furthermore, a core health component that will improve access for parents/families to needed infant/child health services and supports through a single point of entry is the expansion of county-level Central Intake (CI) Hubs. CI (currently operating in 15 counties) helps to build stronger connections and communication, and supports health literacy between parents, health care providers, and early learning programs. Although these additional hubs will be established in year two of RTT-ELC, significant work went into the creation of an RFP that DOH released in January. The notice of grant award will be made by DOH in April, 2015.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

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

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

	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Number of Children with High Needs screened	75,399	75,399	79,169	83,128	87,284	86,880			
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	7,104	7,104	7,459	7,832	8,224	9,991			
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	73,648	73,648	77,330	81,197	85,257	85,142			
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	72,239	72,239	75,851	79,644	83,626	82,536			

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Data Notes

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

Data in Table (C)(3)(d) is estimated based on enrollment. Baseline data inadvertently omitted infants and toddlers. The increase in Year 1 Actuals reflects the addition of these target populations. Enrollment in NJ State Pre-K, Early Head Start/Head Start, CCDF childcare, and evidence-based Home Visiting programs require children to meet basic health standards, as reflected above.

Furthermore, in several early learning programs - NJ Home Visiting, Head Start/Early Head Start, and state-funded preschool programs - NJ has a strong alignment of health service components with the Medicaid/NJ FamilyCare (CHIP) Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment requirements; and, as appropriate, with the Child Find provisions for identifying children with potential disabilities. In fact, NJ licensing standards for early learning programs require children to have a medical exam upon entry that includes immunizations, and lead testing; thus providing a basis for the Medicaid/NJ FamilyCare (CHIP) Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment (EPSDT) program requirements.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Target Notes

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

New Jersey's efforts aim to quantify and expand the numbers of children who:

1. Receive developmental screening (using the ASQ and ASQ: SE screening tool)
2. Are referred for services based on the results of those screenings, and, where appropriate, receiving follow-up
3. Will receive ongoing health care
4. Are up to date in a schedule of well-child care visits, immunizations, developmental screening, etc.

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

Has the State made progress in:

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

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

In year one of implementing RTT-ELC, New Jersey has attempted to build on the state's past achievement in involving families as leaders in their child's early learning. Such an approach has been well-established in our State Preschool Program, Head Start, and home-visiting programs. As we look to expand upon previous successes, New Jersey has included Family Engagement Standards in Grow NJ Kids, as well as focused the activities of the Family Engagement Committee of the New Jersey Council for Young Children on the development of Family Engagement Standards.

The NJ Family and Community Engagement Committee was formed to bring together representatives of family and child serving agencies to oversee the Family Engagement Initiative. In addition, the committee sought to coordinate the state's family engagement initiatives, and to create a set of common goals for the allocation of family engagement resources across the early childhood system as well as support family and child serving agencies to improve how families are engaged in their child's early care and education. Finally, the committee worked to promote family engagement strategies at the program and provider level and to highlight available resources that support the implementation of those family engagement strategies.

Research shows that when families are safe, healthy, and financially secure, they have a better chance of thriving. Strong families can build positive relationships with their children, peers, and communities as well as help children discover how to manage emotions and behaviors and establish healthy bonds. Children can learn to adjust to new situations and resolve conflicts.

These important skills help lead to success as strong families can help children succeed in school and in life. We envision, the Family Engagement Standards will provide resources and strategies to strengthen family well-being for the early childhood community. In addition, we hope the Family Engagement standards will provide strategies to enhance positive parent-child relationships, which build the foundation for children's learning. As such, the committee recommended the following three practices:

- Recommended Practice 1: build strong relationship to ensure access to resources and services that promote family well-being.
- Recommended Practice 2: foster educational success at home and school.
- Recommended Practice 3: encourage lifelong learning opportunities with families, caregivers and children.

In year two of the grant, the committee will pivot to develop modules that will help to train families in these standards. One vehicle for the implementation of these modules will be the County Councils for Young Children (CCYC). The CCYC will have a direct link to the New Jersey Council for Young Children (NJCYC) through the work of the Family and Community Engagement Committee. This committee will solicit input from parents/families to ensure that NJ's families and communities are knowledgeable about the available services/supports that comprise NJ's comprehensive early childhood system of care. The NJCYC Family and Community Engagement Committee will serve in an advisory capacity to support the development of the CCYC in each county.

Priorities for CCYCs:

- Establish a CCYC in each county that builds working relationships between families with children (prenatal to age 8), child care, preschool, health, home visiting, Head Start, family support, early intervention, and other community service providers, and local stakeholders.
- Implement a shared leadership model that supports parents in leadership roles and brings parents and providers together as partners.
- The CCYC will recruit parents to promote their active participation as a voice for change at the family, community, and state level. Include ongoing outreach to engage and retain hard-to-reach parents/caregivers (e.g. fathers, grandparents, immigrants, migrant workers, military service members, etc.).
- Provide parents with an orientation, ongoing mentoring, and leadership training opportunities.
- Provide concrete supports to enable parent/family participation (e.g. childcare, transportation, light meal, and/or other incentive).
- Promote growing parent/family participation over the three-plus years of the project that reflects the cultural diversity of the community.
- Recognize, support and encourage parents as decision makers and leaders and create an engaging and respectful environment that welcomes their presence and input.
- Inform/impact/develop local (and state) policies, services, and/or practices to become more responsive to the needs of families in the county (and NJ).
- Contribute to the development and implementation of high quality early childhood services, including the development of NJ's quality rating improvement system (QRIS), Grow NJ Kids.
- Identify professional development training needs for the local workforce that best supports the proposed policies, priorities, services and/or practices that were developed by the CCYC.

In November, DCF announced the 17 recipients of the CCYC that will lead councils throughout the state (the remaining 3 awards were made in January 2015). The county awards are listed below:

Atlantic

Robin's Nest

Camden

Community Planning and Advocacy Council

Cape May

Quality Care Resources and Referral Services, Inc.

Essex

Programs for Parents

Gloucester

Tri-County Community Action Agency, Inc.

Hudson

Urban League of Hudson County

Hunterdon

NORWESCAP

Mercer

Tri-County Community Action Agency, Inc.

Monmouth

Visiting Nurse Association of Central New Jersey

Morris

NORWESCAP

Ocean

Visiting Nurse Association of Central New Jersey

Passaic

United Way of Passaic County

Salem

Tri-County Community Action Agency, Inc.

Somerset

Empower Somerset

Sussex

Project Self-Sufficiency

Union

Community Coordinated Child Care of Union

Warren

NORWESCAP

The funding period for this the first year of funding is November 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014.

*Cumberland County is being funded with federal Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) funds.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

Has the State made progress in developing:

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

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

Before New Jersey received RTT-ELC funds, the Workforce Subcommittee of the New Jersey Council for Young Children carried out two integral projects to comprehensively revise and improve its existing NJ Core Knowledge and Competencies (CKC). These projects included: 1) Strengthening the statewide CKC and 2) Mapping and evaluating the quality of professional preparation and professional development opportunities for the early childhood workforce in New Jersey.

In year one of implementation, New Jersey has revised its CKC, which contains all the elements required by the application definition, addresses identified gaps and recommendations from two projects, aligns with the statewide career lattice, and engages postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities to the revised Framework.

The Core Knowledge Competencies draft was put out to bid for editing purposes in October. The original timeline has this activity completed in year one. However, the committee had difficulty securing an editor and this has delayed the project a few months. Regardless, the committee prepares itself to pivot on the more pressing task of assisting higher education implement the CKC. To this end, we have already arranged to present at the New Jersey Presidents' Council as a way to engage college Presidents in CKC as well as other RTT-ELC projects.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

Has the State made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that:

Kindergarten Entry Assessment	
Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness	Yes
Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities	Yes
Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the third year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten (e.g., the 2014-2015 school year for Round 1 grantee states, the 2015-2016 school year for Round 2 grantees). States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation	Yes
Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws	Yes
Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA)	Yes

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

Beginning in July of 2014, a total of two hundred teachers and ninety-four district level administrators across twenty-five districts, were trained in Teaching Strategies GOLD (GOLD), a rigorous and appropriate performance-based assessment instrument. During the first seven weeks of kindergarten, teachers collected evidence of children's performance across three of the nine Teaching Strategies Gold domains including, social emotional, literacy, and mathematics, for the purpose of assigning a score along a continuum that ranges from “Not Yet to 9.” Once teachers made ratings for each child at the end of the seven-week period, teachers, administrators, and DOE representatives were able to view scores of individual children as well as aggregate scores across all districts within each learning domain. As a way to inform instruction and monitor goal setting through the year, all teachers are continuing to use GOLD throughout the entire school year.

Prior to making the initial rating of children's performance at entry, teachers completed a reliability assessment that added credence to the accuracy of teacher ratings. One Technical Assistance Visit was made by Teaching Strategies within the first seven weeks, as well as three live webinars, and one teacher/administrator survey occurring at the end of the seven-week period to gauge the level of implementation. As a strategy to support best practices in the kindergarten year, teachers participating in NJKEA also attended the Kindergarten Seminars, which is a five day regional series that began in late October of 2014 and ends in April of 2015. This exciting and novel approach to support NJKEA implementation proved fruitful in that year one of

implementation has revolved around best practices (e.g., curricular, whole-child learning, and appropriate environments) rather than merely another assessment initiative.

The seminars provide participants with an introduction to key features of New Jersey's Kindergarten Implementation Guidelines and the NJKEA initiative. The series includes sessions to support teachers in organizing classroom environments and schedules, implementing developmentally appropriate practices, applying effective teaching strategies that support children's development and learning, incorporating the common core standards and weaving in the GOLD assessment cycle throughout. Finally, all participants will use the instrument throughout the kindergarten year as a formative assessment tool.

While it is true that teachers often complete many assessments within districts, it is rare that teachers complete assessments that include the full range of developmental learning domains that recognize the complexity of young children, such as Social & Emotional Development, Cognition, and Approaches to Learning domains.

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.

As mentioned above, a total of two hundred teachers and ninety-four district level administrators across twenty-five districts, were trained in Teaching Strategies GOLD (GOLD), a rigorous and appropriate performance-based assessment instrument. Throughout the year, we have been soliciting participation for subsequent years. In fact, we even ran a track of the Kindergarten Seminar for teachers and administrators that are planning to participate during the 2015-2016 school year. Lastly, in early spring we will make presentation at superintendent round table meetings throughout the state (most of these are already scheduled) to finalize participation for the following year as well as communicate the timing for professional development offerings. We intend on continuing this process throughout the life of the grant.

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

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

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

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

New Jersey has proposed to use grant funds to establish the initial structure for NJ-EASEL, the state's data warehouse. Furthermore, New Jersey has proposed to have NJ's Office of Information Technology (OIT) assume responsibility for maintenance of NJ-EASEL post-grant.

However, New Jersey has faced challenges during the first year of implementing the Data Systems project. We are currently behind in our SOW for this project due to a lack of clarity on where the project would be housed.

Although implementing Project 8: Data Systems has been a challenge during the first year of implementation, we worked closely with state OIT to build the specs for our data system. They have walked us through our research questions to ensure we will get the most desirable system. These meetings, initially occurring on a bi-weekly basis helped to keep the project moving. However, the biggest strategy to address this challenge is bringing in a full-time project manager to focus on the approved SOW and cross-agency collaboration necessary to ensure success. Starting in January 2015, we will have a project manager to focus exclusively on this project.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income ¹ families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	36,812	6.9%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	75,235	14.1%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	74,586	14.0%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	186,632	35.0%

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

Data Table (A)(1)-1 Data Notes

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, "Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Single Year of Age and Sex for the United States, States, and Puerto Rico Commonwealth: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013"; and National KIDS COUNT Program "Children Ages 0 to 8 below 200 Percent Poverty 2013".

Census data projections for 2013 were used along with the percent of children Ages 0 to 8 whose families were below 200% of poverty in New Jersey in 2013 (35%) to estimate the number of children from low-income families in the state in these specific age ranges.

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

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs		
Special Populations: Children who...	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays ¹	28,261	14.42%
Are English learners ²	159,971	81.61%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	0	0.00%
Are migrant ³	320	0.16%
Are homeless ⁴	3,999	2.18%
Are in foster care	3,447	1.63%

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

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

For disabilities or developmental delays: Number is estimated for children birth to kindergarten entry based on the percentage of students with disabilities in state-funded preschool programs.

For ELL: Number is estimated for children birth to kindergarten entry based on the percent of children ages five and older speaking a language other than English in the home (US Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2009-2013).

For Migrant: Number is estimated based on percent of migrant children, preschool-grade 12, captured in the state's longitudinal data system during the 2013-14 school year.

For Homeless: Number is estimated based on percent of homeless children, preschool-grade 12, captured in the state's CPSR during the 2013-14 school year.

For Foster Care: Point in time data collection in June 2014 from the Department of Children and Families' NJ SPIRIT data system.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool	-	-	43,891	43,891
Specify:	State Preschool Program			
Data Source and Year:	2013-14 Projected Enrollment from individual state-approved budgets for each district.			
Early Head Start & Head Start¹	434	1,531	13,499	15,464
Data Source and Year:	NJ Head Start Collaboration Office and the Program Information Report 2012			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	686	10,123	12,031	22,840
Data Source and Year:	Part C I/T: December 1, 2012 Federal Child Count (Point in Time) Cumulative data not available by age. Part B (Prek): October 15, 2012 Application for State School Aid census count.			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	-	10,780	10,780
Data Source and Year:	Total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the 2011-12 Consolidated State Performance Report.			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	2,684	10,821	11,706	25,211
Data Source and Year:	Child Care Viewer Report, October 2012.			
Other 1	-	-	8,028	8,028
Specify:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs			
Data Source and Year:	2013-14 Projected Enrollment from individual state-approved budgets for each district.			
Other 2	2,777	2,373	278	5,428
Specify:	Home Visiting (excludes pregnant women)			
Data Source and Year:	-			

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

Data Table (A)(1)-3a Data Notes

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

Programs funded under Title I of ESEA

Over 99% of the children supported through Title I funds are served in districts within the DOE's three preschool programs. 2013 figures are not yet available. The number of children 0-5 served through Title I has historically varied from year to year. However, we estimate at least a stable number of children from 2012 to 2013 as we believe many of these districts are currently using Title I funding to support summer programs for preschool-aged children.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Hispanic Children	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	22,572	84	1,580	14,113	105	300	5,136
Specify:	State Preschool Program						
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	8,189	62	415	5,833	19	1,029	4,052
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	3,245	11	674	1,116	19	443	5,301
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619		14	933	1,613	46	228	5,674
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	4,624	17	392	3,376	31	73	2,267
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	10,292	13	264	9,534	58	179	4,601
Other 1	2,667	13	596	1,484	22	142	3,104
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs						
Other 2	2,196	15	46	1,459	69	154	879
Describe:	Home Visiting (excludes pregnant women)						
Other 3	3,009		97	3,105		97	6,212
Describe:	Special Child Health Services Case Management						
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.							

Data Table (A)(1)-3b Data Notes

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

The total number of children in Head Start centers above adds up to more than the children listed on Tables 3 and 5 due to classification of children in multiple categories.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start¹	\$39,800,000	\$40,300,000			
State-funded preschool	\$591,800,000	\$603,700,000			
Specify:	State Preschool Program				
State contributions to IDEA, Part C	\$85,900,000	\$85,900,000			
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$56,900,000	\$59,800,000			
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$72,100,000	\$72,200,000			
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Not Met	Not Met			
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$54,200,000	\$76,000,000			
Other State contributions 1	\$41,900,000	\$44,000,000			
Specify:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs				
Other State contributions 2	\$20,600,000	\$20,600,000			
Specify:	Evidence-Based Home Visiting (HV)				
Other State contributions 3	\$650,000	\$650,000			
Specify:	Strengthening Families / PF Framework				
Other State contributions 4	\$40,000	\$30,000			
Specify:	Help Me Grow				
Other State contributions 5		\$140,000			
Specify:	ECCS Grant				
Other State contributions 6		\$800,000			
Specify:	Project Launch				
Total State contributions:	\$1,010,000,000	\$1,050,000,000			

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.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program¹			
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2
State-funded preschool <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	43,671	43,891	
Specify:	State Preschool Program		
Early Head Start and Head Start² <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	15,944	15,464	
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	12,031	22,840	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)</i>	10,780	10,780	
Programs receiving CCDF funds <i>(average monthly served)</i>	23,849	25,211	
Other 1	8,189	8,028	
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs		
Other 2	5,316	6,194	
Describe:	Special Child Health Services Birth Registry		
Other 3	4,878	5,428	
Describe:	Home Visiting - statewide network of multiple models - pregnancy to age 3		
Other 4	1,799	2,818	
Describe:	Special Child Health Services Autism Registry		
Other 5	10,454	11,241	
Describe:	Special Child Health Services (Medically Fragile Children)		
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.

Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619

2014 data is not yet available. As estimated is provided based on the average increase over the prior three years.

Programs funded under Title I of ESEA

Over 99% of the children supported through Title I funds are served in districts within the DOE's three preschool programs. 2014 figures are not yet available. The number of children 0-5 served through Title I has historically varied from year to year. However, we estimate at least a stable number of children from 2013 to 2014 as we believe many of these districts are currently using Title I funding to support summer programs for preschool-aged children.

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

Check marks indicate the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards			
Essential Domains of School Readiness	Age Groups		
	Infants	Toddlers	Preschoolers
Language and literacy development	✓	✓	✓
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)	✓	✓	✓
Approaches toward learning	✓	✓	✓
Physical well-being and motor development	✓	✓	✓
Social and emotional development	✓	✓	✓

Data Table (A)(1)-6 Data Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

No changes during the first year of implementation.

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

Check marks indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State					
Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Specify:	State Preschool Program				
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹					
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C		✓			✓
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓	✓			
Programs receiving CCDF funds					
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)	✓		✓		✓
Tier 1					
Tier 2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tier 3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tier 4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tier 5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
State licensing requirements	✓		✓		✓
Other 1	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Describe:	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs				
Other 2	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Describe:	Evidence-Based Home Visiting (HV)				
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

Data Table (A)(1)-7 Data Notes

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

State-funded preschool (including contracted Head Start programs):

- Screening Measures: Early Screening Inventory-Revised;
- Formative Assessment: For the State Preschool Program, a district board of education shall ensure that all preschool classroom teachers conduct ongoing performance-based assessment of children that:
 - Is aligned with the comprehensive curriculum described in the school district's five-year preschool program plan and/or annual update as required and approved by the Department of Education; and
 - Addresses all learning domains. Instruments currently approved include: Work Sampling System, Teaching Strategies GOLD, and The Child Observation Record (COR);

- Measures of Environmental Quality: Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R); and
- Measures of Adult-Child Interactions: Supports for Early Literacy Assessment (SELA) and the Preschool Classroom Mathematical Inventory (PCMI); Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)
- Other: Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT)

IDEA Part B, 619:

- Special education programs follow general education requirements for all assessments.
- Other: Entry and exit evaluations required for Outcome Study.

Head Start and Early Head Start:

- Screening Measures: ESI-R, Brigance;
- Formative Assessment: Teaching Strategies GOLD or Child Observation Record (COR);
- Measures of Environmental Quality: ECERS-R and ITERS
- Measures of Adult-Child Interactions: Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)
- Other: TPITOS; Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT)

Evidence-Based Home Visiting (Healthy Families, Nurse-Family Partnership and Parents As Teachers):

- Screening Measures: Ages & Stages Questionnaire (ASQ), ASQ Social-Emotional (ASQ:SE)
- Formative Assessment: Routine/ongoing use of ASQ and ASQ:SE in combination with visit observation/interaction monitor the infant/child progress in development and early learning
- Measures of Environmental Quality: Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment: HOME Inventory. Environment is broadly defines and includes parent-child interaction.
- Other: Prenatal Screening/Risk Assessment (PRA) identifies risk factors for newborns/infants

State Licensing Requirements:

- Screening Measures: Physical exams, immunizations, Universal Child Health Record, and special care plans - medical treatment needs, program/environmental modifications, diet, rest, allergies, etc.
- Formative Assessment: For state-funded preschool, a district board of education shall ensure that all preschool classroom teachers conduct ongoing performance-based assessment of children that: Is aligned with the comprehensive curriculum described in the school district's five-year preschool program plan and/or annual update as required and approved by the Department; Addresses all learning domains; Uses multiple sources of evidence gathered over time; Is used for curriculum planning and reporting to parents; and Is not used to determine the classroom placement of children.
- Measures of Environmental Quality: DEP and DOH requirements are for lead, asbestos, space requirements, play space requirements and playground safety.
- Measures of Adult-Child Interactions: Ratio requirements are based on ages, group size, special needs; staff training on positive guidance and discipline, program planning and development, creating a classroom environment and health and safety procedures. Promoting positive staff and child interactions, promoting family involvement and communication; family support and community resources.
- Other: Staff and children's records checklist requires the center to track all required documents including CHRI and CARI check.

Budget and Expenditure Tables

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

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

Budget Summary Table

Budget Summary Table					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$239,425.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$239,425.53
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,777.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$26,777.15
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$4,333.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,333.73
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)	\$270,536.41	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$270,536.41
10. Indirect Costs	\$4,514.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,514.05
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$149,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$149,300.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$50,812.07	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$50,812.07
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$475,162.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$475,162.53
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$19,671,594.87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,671,594.87
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$20,146,757.40	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,146,757.40

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

In general, it took longer than expected to begin expending grant funding for several of our projects in Year 1. However, New Jersey is now on a solid path towards meeting all of the goals and objectives detailed in our State Plan. We have taken a thoughtful approach to reallocating unspent funding specifically to meet those goals and objectives.

Please see below for a description that is both detailed and project specific of budget discrepancies occurring in Year 1 as well as proposed budget adjustments. .

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

In general, it took longer than expected to begin expending grant funding for several of our projects in Year 1. However, New Jersey is now on a solid path towards meeting all of the goals and objectives detailed in our State Plan. We have taken a thoughtful approach to reallocating unspent funding specifically to meet those goals and objectives.

Please see below for a description that is both detailed and project specific of budget discrepancies occurring in Year 1 as well as proposed budget adjustments.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Administration

Budget Table: Project 1					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$239,425.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$239,425.53
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,777.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$26,777.15
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$4,333.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,333.73
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)	\$270,536.41	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$270,536.41
10. Indirect Costs	\$4,514.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,514.05
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	\$50,812.07	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$50,812.07
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$325,862.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$325,862.53
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$86,120.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$86,120.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$411,982.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$411,982.53

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

Project 1 Budget Narrative

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

Unspent Year 1 funding from Project 1 is largely attributable to salary, fringe benefits and indirect costs (\$444,957). Remaining unspent funding in Year 1 is from our allocations for travel, equipment, indirect and other costs. Our approved budget for Project 1 reflected immediate start dates for all staff. However, it took several months to post for positions and hire all necessary staff, resulting in unspent funding in salary, benefit, indirect, travel, equipment, and other cost lines.

A change in Project 8 also contributed significantly to our unspent salary and benefit dollars. DOE information technology staff, working on the tasks related to our Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS), were initially budgeted in Project 1. However, after our budget was approved, New Jersey's plan for Project 8 changed. The state's Office of Information Technology (out of our Department of Treasury) is now developing the infrastructure for our ECIDS through an interdepartmental agreement. As a result of this change, the funding we initially dedicated for information technology staff within the DOE from Years 1-4 is now needed within Project 8 (see below).

Project 1 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We are proposing to transfer a total of \$761,177 from Project 1 to Project 8, including unspent salary, benefit and indirect funding from Year 1, as well as salary, benefit and indirect costs from Years 2-4 for DOE information technology staff. The transfer of funding from Project 1 to Project 8 will ensure our ability to meet our goals for Project 8 (see Project 8 below).

Phone and technology costs budgeted for full-time grant staff have not yet been charged to the grant. We anticipate that the full \$11,000 initially budgeted for these costs will be expended within the first several months of Year 2, and so this funding was reallocated from Year 1 to Year 2. Unspent funding for in-state travel in Year 1 (\$1,350), plus an additional \$2,000, was transferred throughout Years 2-4. Year 1 in-state travel for the Executive Director has not yet been charged to the grant, and we are anticipating larger expenditures for the remaining years of the grant. Remaining unspent funding was transferred to the equipment and supplies lines in Years 2-4. Our original budget underestimated the cost of laptop computers, and did not account for basic office supplies needed for grant-funded staff. We are estimating \$2,000 per year for office supplies, and based this estimate on current costs for state staff within the DOE.

Budget Table: Project 2 – Aligned Training and Professional Development

Budget Table: Project 2					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$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	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$15,037,660.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,037,660.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$15,037,660.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,037,660.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 2 Budget Narrative

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

The largest budget component of Project 2 is our MOU with Rutgers University to administer the Training Academy. The four-year budget for the Training Academy was initially estimated at \$7,119,504, with Year 1 costs of \$1,286,705. It took approximately 11 months to announce, award, and sign the MOU, resulting in lower than expected Year 1 costs, which were not billed until the start of Year 2 (an invoice has already been received). However, Rutgers identified several areas in which our initial estimates for the Training Academy were lacking. For example, our initial estimates failed to take into account the need for office space and equipment for Academy staff. Also, Rutgers introduced the need for additional support within the structure of the Training Academy including a Professional Learning Community Coordinators, Business Manager, and an Administrative Assistant. During the MOU process, Rutgers submitted a budget detailing their estimated costs over the grant period, reallocating the original budget over the remainder of the grant period. We are confident that the full estimated budget for the Academy will be expended by the end of the grant period, with unspent Year 1 funding reallocated to items previously omitted from budget estimates.

Our approved Year 1 budget also included \$854,150 for direct curriculum training. This training was intended for pilot and Year 1 Grow NJ Kids participants who would be ready for training prior to the establishment of the Training Academy. However, this need was reevaluated during the course of the year. It took longer than anticipated to enroll our Year 1 Grow NJ Kids participants, and many of our pilot programs expressed a need for more basic trainings prior to their need for curriculum training. As a result, a small portion of these funds (\$90,450) were reallocated to DHS, through a revised MOA, to provide reliability and overview training in the ITES to a cohort of Grow NJ Kids participants. Another \$250,922 was added to our MOU for the Training Academy to meet their identified needs. We intend to reallocate all remaining funding for other identified needs through budget transfers (see Projects 7 (\$441,454) and 9 (\$80,000)).

Finally, our approved Year 1 budget included \$5,195 to contract with an editor to review and revise our Core Knowledge and Competencies Framework document. Despite several attempts to reach out to editors through our bidding process, we have not been able to hire an individual to do this work. Our intention is to transfer this funding into our Year 2 budget and continue to search for a qualified individual to finalize this document. We anticipate identifying an editor in March.

Project 2 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

As noted above, we are seeking budget amendments to reallocate approved Year 1 funding for the following:

- Training Academy: \$1,289,630 (including indirect) in unspent funding from Year 1 reallocated to Years 2-4 for additional costs not initially anticipated within the budget, but necessary to establish the Training Academy (computers, office space, office equipment, critical staff, etc.)
- Direct Training: \$854,150 in unspent funding from Year 1 initially intended for direct curriculum training will be reallocated for other identified needs within Projects 7 (\$441,454) and 9 (\$80,000) (see descriptions in project areas below). Also, \$90,450 of this funding was used by DHS to provide ITES overview and reliability training, and \$250,922 was reallocated into the Training Academy budget.
- Editing for Core Competencies: \$5,195 in unspent funding from Year 1 reallocated to Year 2 to continue our search for an editor.

The above changes are in line with our scope of work and overall grant goals, and will not impact our ability to meet our project outcomes.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Grow NJ Kids Rollout and Incentives Administration

Budget Table: Project 3					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00

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

Project 3 Budget Narrative

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

While we met our objectives for Year 1 enrollment in Grow NJ Kids, it took longer than anticipated to meet this goal. As a result, we did not have any programs finish their self-assessment in time to request incentives during Year 1 of the grant. However, we did have important conversations with our Year 1 programs, who helped us identify ways in which to make our incentive offerings more responsive to their needs. We will be redistributing all Year 1 incentives funding (\$2,596,000) to Years 2-4, which will allow us to meet those needs (see below for explanation). This funding will all remain within Line 11.

It also took longer than anticipated to hire the Grant Administrator for Incentives we budgeted for in Years 1-4. Our Administrator started at the beginning of Year 2, leaving all Year 1 salary, benefit, and indirect funding unspent. That funding (\$113,342) will also be reallocated to Line 11 for our incentives in Years 2-4 (see below).

For the length of the grant period, we also budgeted \$120,000 to hire a consultant to facilitate public/private partnerships that, we hope, will help us sustain the work of the grant after 2017. Identifying our needs and the right person to undertake this work has proved to be more difficult than we expected. After several meetings with foundations and individuals with experience in this kind of work, we believe we have found a consultant to bring on board in Year 2. Our intention is to increase the number of hours this individual will work with us on an annual basis, in which case we will reallocate approximately \$115,680 of the original budget for this work over 3 years instead of 4. We also plan to transfer these dollars from Project 3 to Project 7, as this work is more in line with the activities in the scope of work for our Public Outreach and Awareness project. The remaining \$4,320 for this portion of Project 3 will be transferred to and used within the equipment line in Year 2 (see below).

Project 3 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The majority of proposed changes made to the Project 3 budget are related to our incentives offerings. Our original budget included up to 1,500 scholarships of \$6,000 for teachers and directors; up to 1,500 scholarships of \$2,000 for teacher assistants and family child care providers; and up to \$500 per room for classroom improvement grants (with a maximum of \$10,000 per site). After working with Grow NJ Kids participant sites for the past several months, we have identified several other incentives needed to make our scholarship offerings more realistic and meaningful. We are not proposing any changes to the annual amounts budgeted for classroom incentives in Years 2-4, nor are we proposing to change the original scholarship amounts awarded in Years 2-4. However, we are proposing to transfer all unspent Year 1 incentives funding (\$2,709,342) to address these newly identified needs. We are also proposing to offer fewer overall scholarships in order to establish more realistic annual goals. More importantly, reducing the overall number of scholarships will allow us to repurpose funding to provide additional supports to a smaller number of scholarship recipients and their programs. Ultimately, we would still provide at least 2,000 scholarships (instead of 3,000), and we feel that these scholarships are now more in line with the needs of program staff.

Our revised incentives offerings will include funding for remedial coursework, books, substitutes, and on-site support in specifically identified counties as follows:

- **Remedial Coursework:** Programs have expressed the need for remedial coursework for staff who are not yet prepared for college level coursework. Based on conversations with community colleges, we

agree that this is a significant concern, and something needed to raise the overall level of quality across early care and education programs. As a result, we are prepared to offer \$600 to an estimated 75% of new scholarship recipients in Years 2 and 3 of the grant, for a total of \$900,000. Community colleges have confirmed that \$600 will cover 4 remedial courses per student.

- **Substitutes:** Programs have articulated the need for substitute teachers and assistants for days when staff are being trained through the Academy and/or are taking college classes. We would like to use \$950,000 annually to provide stipends for programs to hire substitutes to ease the burden of staff being out of the classroom for Grow NJ Kids trainings and other classes. Funding will be capped at a maximum of \$10,000 per site per year in order to ensure that funding is available for as many programs as possible. We are estimating approximately \$100 per day per substitute.
- **Book Stipends:** We have been made aware that book stipends will help ease the financial burden of staff with scholarships for college courses. We are proposing to offer a \$175 stipend to at least 75% of first year scholarship recipients (Years 2 and 3). Stipends will be provided only on a reimbursement basis, and the number of stipends awarded will depend on the number of scholarship applicants. The total cost for Years 2 and 3 is anticipated at \$262,500.
- **Quality Improvement Specialists:** As our new Grow NJ Kids participants enroll, we have identified a significant need for additional Quality Improvement Specialists (QIS's) to assist programs with their self-assessments. We are only anticipating this cost in Year 2 of the grant, as we believe that this will be a temporary need. Five additional QIS's are estimated at a cost of \$75,000 per person including salary and benefits (\$375,000 total).
- **Professional Impact NJ:** The added variety of incentives proposed will require additional administration from Professional Impact NJ (PINJ). At this time, grant funding is not supporting those costs. We are proposing to use approximately \$100,000 per year to support the administrative needs of PINJ for Years 2-4 of the grant period. DHS has estimated this amount based on their current contract with PINJ and similar work PINJ undertook in the administration of scholarships for the former Abbott districts.

We believe that the above changes will allow us to meet our project goal of improving program quality through direct technical assistance and meaningful scholarships for early childhood program staff.

After moving \$115,680 from Project 3 to Project 7 for our public/private partnerships consultant, we intend to use the remaining \$4,320 in the equipment line in Year 2. Additional laptop computer equipment is needed for three staff working on Grow NJ Kids initiatives. These staff work primarily in the field, providing technical assistance to Grow NJ Kids participants, and this equipment will allow them to more effectively meet the needs of our QRIS programs.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Independent Ratings for Program Quality Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 4 Budget Narrative

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

William Paterson University (WPU) will be overseeing the independent ratings system for Grow NJ Kids participants through an MOU with the DOE. Although the MOU was only just recently signed, the delay did not impact our work. The first round of Grow NJ Kids participants are not yet ready to be rated, providing us with additional time to work with WPU on the ratings system. We are proposing to redistribute the \$538,965 in grant funding initially budgeted for this project in Year 1 to Years 2-4 as described below.

Project 4 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Once William Paterson University was identified as the entity that would oversee our independent ratings system, we began in-depth conversations about how ratings will need to be conducted. These conversations led to the conclusion that our original budget for the ratings system was not sufficient to support the time and amount of work needed to accurately rate Grow NJ Kids programs. As a result, WPU has reworked the original budget to reflect what they believe will be their estimated annual costs to operate our ratings system, while staying within the original total budget amount. This revised budget is reflected in our recently signed MOU. The changes reflect adjustments to the procedures needed for conducting ratings throughout the state, staffing adjustments needed to accommodate higher reliability thresholds on selected instruments, and additional coordination with Training Academy for instrument trainings and the training of new staff and consultants. No line item changes are required for this budget transfer, and all project outcomes will still be met.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Validating the Grow NJ Kids Tiered QRIS

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

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

Project 5 Budget Narrative

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

The National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) at Rutgers University was selected to oversee our validation of Grow NJ Kids. No grant funding was anticipated for Year 1, so there are no discrepancies to report.

Project 5 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Experts at NIEER are in the process of designing our validation system. Once completed, we do expect that the budget for this project will change. Initial budget estimates from NIEER show that Year 2 costs may be slightly lower than expected, while Year 3 and 4 costs may be slightly higher than expected. Once the system is designed, we will reevaluate the overall budget with NIEER and submit any necessary budget transfers.

Budget Table: Project 6 – Family Engagement and Health Promotion

Budget Table: Project 6					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$149,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$149,300.00
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)	\$149,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$149,300.00
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)	\$149,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$149,300.00

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

Project 6 Budget Narrative

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

Department of Children and Families

It took longer than anticipated for DCF to hire the two full-time Strengthening Families (SF) Specialists projected in our budget for Project 6. Both Specialists were hired in August 2014, leaving approximately \$19,865 in unused salary and benefit dollars as well as \$1,945 in unused funding for travel, indirect, and computer costs. DCF's RFP process for the 20 new County Councils for Young Children (CCYCs) was also delayed, with 17 grants awarded in November 2014 and the remaining 3 awarded in January 2015. This delay resulted in \$574,770 in unspent funding. DCF is proposing to infuse a portion of this funding back into the CCYC's, but does not anticipate that the CCYC's need this full amount to successfully meet the goals of the grant (see details below).

Department of Health

In Year 1, DOH also intended to complete an RFP process for Central Intake Hubs in six counties. The RFP process for Central Intake was delayed, in part because of discussions related to the actual amounts needed to adequately oversee the Hubs in each of the remaining counties. As a result, all Year 1 funding (\$230,945) was unspent.

Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Department of Children and Families

The Department of Children and Families (DCF) has identified several ways in which the total \$596,580 in unspent Year 1 funding may be reallocated to support the current activities of the grant. First, DCF has recognized the need to provide startup funding to each of the new County Councils. Feedback from our one existing County Council indicates that new programs will need one-time funding to set up office space, purchase equipment, and initiate the recruitment of families. DCF estimates startup costs at \$20,000 for each of the 20 new Councils, totaling \$400,000 in grant Year 2.

Second, DCF field staff are in need of laptop computers to efficiently accomplish their work. DCF estimates the cost at \$1,050 per laptop for 3 staff, for a total of \$3,150 in Year 1. These field staff are actively involved in the work of the CCYC's and travel extensively throughout the state, along with two grant funded staff, to provide technical assistance to our 21 new CCYC's.

The above reallocations are in line with the state plan and our approved scope of work. With the remaining \$193,430 in unspent funding from Year 1, DCF is proposing to fund three new priorities that were not addressed in our original budget. If approved to do so, we will modify our scopes of work to include tasks associated with these three new priorities.

First, DCF's *Keeping Babies and Children in Mind* (KBCM) infant/early childhood mental health (IECMH) training is only currently scheduled to run through August 2015. This training has been extremely well received by our cross-sector early childhood partners, and the need (and demand) is high for additional training sessions. DCF is requesting to use \$54,660 in unspent Year 1 funding to continue training sessions through December 2015 and expand the training statewide. The Training Academy will not be equipped to provide this funding in 2015, but we anticipate that it will have sufficient capacity to do so in Year 3 of the grant.

Second, DCF has identified the need for formal parent leadership training in each of the 21 County Councils for Young Children. This training will build capacity within each CCYC for parents to truly lead each of the Councils. In Year 2, DCF is proposing to use \$71,570 in grant funding to issue an RFP for parent leadership training.

Finally, as DCF and RTT-ELC partners work collaboratively to expand developmental screening, a critical need has been identified to have a MIS Tracking System for Infant/Child Developmental Screening that can track the use of standard screening instruments (e.g. Ages & Stages Questionnaire (ASQ), ASQ Social-Emotional Scale (ASQ:SE), and others). At the RTT-ELC Grantee Meeting, DCF spoke with Vermont about their data tracking system. After an internal planning meeting with DOH, and a technical assistance phone call with Vermont in December 2014, NJ partners (DCF and DOH) identified specific next steps needed to track developmental screenings and ensure links with pediatric primary care providers. As a result, DCF is requesting to use \$67,200 in unspent Year 1 funding to hire a Business Analyst (estimate of \$60/hour for 35 hours/week x 32 weeks) to complete a thorough business process analysis that:

- Details process flow from screening providers (across sectors --health care, child care, EHS/HS, Home Visiting, Pre-K);
- Identifies MIS requirements and specifications;
- Examines feasibility and costs; and
- Outlines an implementation timeline.

Additional consulting costs for the Business Analyst (estimated at \$30,000) will be covered by DCF's ECCS Grant.

DCF is requesting one additional budget transfer that impacts grant Years 1-4. The two CCYC coordinators in our approved budget were hired through an agreement with New Jersey's Educational Information and Resource Center (EIRC), an Early Learning Intermediary Organization. Funding initially budgeted in the salary, benefit, travel, indirect and equipment lines will be transferred into Line 11 to accurately account for expenses. The total amount transferred across all 4 years of the grant will be \$655,712. This represents the full \$677,522 originally budgeted for salaries, benefits, travel, equipment and indirect costs, less the \$21,810 in unspent funding related to the delay in hiring mentioned above.

Department of Health

Feedback from the field (the Central Intake Hubs currently operating in 15 counties) indicated that our initially proposed award amounts were not sufficient. We are now proposing to transfer \$230,945 in unspent funding from Year 1 to Years 2-4, to augment the award amounts. The notice of grant award for the Central Intake Hubs will be made on April, 1 2015, and the Department of Health will also be supplementing this amount with additional funding.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Public Outreach and Awareness

Budget Table: Project 7					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$2,124,937.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,124,937.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$2,124,937.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,124,937.00

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

Project 7 Budget Narrative

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

No grant funding was anticipated for Year 1, so there are no discrepancies to report. However, approved travel for two DHS staff to attend a technical assistance conference on communications was inadvertently reported to Year 1 of Project 7 instead of to Project 1, where our technical assistance set-aside funding is budgeted. This error is currently being rectified.

Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any changes to the original budget for Project 7, however, we are requesting to transfer unspent funding from Projects 2 and 3 into Project 7 to more effectively meet the goals of our Public Outreach and Awareness work. First, we would like to transfer \$441,454 in unspent Year 1 funding from Project 2 to the contractual line of Project 7 for development of a newsletter and a website. An existing state contract would be used to contract with a writer to assist the Executive Director in the development of a quarterly newsletter. Regular newsletters will help us keep stakeholders informed about the work of the grant, and Grow NK Kids in particular. Based on similar work, we are estimating approximately \$8,500 per year for the development of the quarterly newsletters (\$26,496 total including 3.9% indirect annually).

An existing state contract would also be used to work with a firm to design and maintain a family-friendly website. Our goal is to design a "one-stop" website where families can easily search for information about early care and education programs, including Grow NJ Kids ratings information. We have limited in-house capacity to develop this kind of website, and feel that an outside firm will be able to design a more user-friendly concept. We are still in the process of exploring the total cost of this initiative, but are estimating \$414,958 (including annual indirect of 3.9%) for Years 2-4 of the grant.

As described in the narrative for Project 3, we are also requesting to transfer \$115,680 from Project 3 to the contractual line of Project 7, as the scope of work for Project 7 is in line with one specific task originally included in Project 3. The funding will support a consultant to assist us in developing public/private partnerships that we hope will ensure the longevity of our grant-related work. We spent significant time in Year 1 identifying an individual to undertake this work, and expect work to start within the first half of Year 2. Our plan is to augment the number of annual hours worked by the consultant to remain in line with our original grant budget for this work.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Data Systems

Budget Table: Project 8					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00

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

Project 8 Budget Narrative

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

Despite the fact that no funding has been expended as of yet for Project 8, a significant amount of work has occurred for this project and we expect to stay on track with our original goals for this project.

Our approved Year 1 budget for Project 8 included \$149,881 in projected expenditures through a contract between DHS and Professional Impact NJ (PINJ). The contract included funding for additional staff to accommodate the influx of programs using our Grow NJ Kids data system (operated through PINJ), as well as additional administrative costs associated with the increase in data records. Although the contract has been in place throughout Year 1, it appears that an error was made in how this funding was being charged. DHS is in the process of rectifying this error, and we expect to see these funds charged to the grant as initially intended. However, because this was not rectified within Year 1, the funding will be transferred to Year 2.

Our approved Year 1 budget for Project 8 also included \$750,975 in projected expenditures for DCF to upgrade our current licensing data system. An approved budget amendment (January 16, 2015) allowed us to transfer this funding to Year 3 of our grant period to allow DCF additional time to research the best possible option for our licensing system.

As discussed in our narrative for Project 1, our approach to New Jersey's Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS) changed significantly between the approval of our scope of work and the end of Year 1. As a result of this change, \$753,808 in Year 1 costs for hardware and contracted staff were not expensed for Project 8.

Project 8 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

In Years 2-4, we are proposing to amend our budget for Project 8 to align with our new approach for New Jersey's ECIDS. Our Office of Information Technology (OIT) will be developing the environment for our ECIDS, while project management and business analysis work will be conducted through the DOE. All funding in the line "other" (approximately \$1,000,000 per year for Years 2-4) will be used to support OIT's work to develop the infrastructure for the ECIDS. To support these costs, we are proposing to transfer \$761,177 in unspent salary and benefit dollars from Project 1 to Project 8. These funds were initially budgeted to support the cost of DOE staff building the infrastructure for the ECIDS, but are now needed in the "other" line to support this work through OIT. In addition, we would also like to transfer \$1,700,000 of the \$1,750,000 budgeted for equipment in Years 1 and 2 to the "other" line for Years 2-4. Now that OIT is building our ECIDS, DOE will not need to make large equipment purchases; however, that funding is now needed to support the cost of OIT's work.

Finally, DOE will use grant funding already budgeted in the "contractual" line in Years 2-4 to support the cost of a project manager and business analyst (\$420,000 in Years 2-3; and \$63,000 in Year 4), with all unspent Year 1 funding transferred to the "other" line to support the work of OIT. The project manager and business analyst will be secured through existing state contracts for information technology projects, and are critical to the success of our ECIDS project.

All transfers with Project 8 will ensure that we meet the project outcomes approved in our scope of work.

Budget Table: Project 9 – Preschool-Third Grade Initiatives

Budget Table: Project 9					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$263,062.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$263,062.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$263,062.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$263,062.00

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

Project 9 Budget Narrative

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

NIEER and the Graduate School of Education (GSE) at Rutgers University are overseeing the development, review, and field testing of our First to Third Grade Guidelines through an MOU. It took longer than expected to execute the MOU, so no costs were expended in Year 1. As a result, the entire budget of \$45,427 will be expended entirely in Year 2, and we have already received an invoice for this work.

Project 9 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

No additional changes are anticipated to the original amounts budgeted for the tasks identified in Project 9. However, we are requesting to transfer \$80,000 from Project 2 to Project 9 for a new task identified as a priority to meet our outcome goals for Project 9. In Year 2 of the grant, NIEER and the GSE will begin to train cohorts of first through third grade teachers on the newly developed guidelines. It has been determined that this training will be enhanced by the development of a training video. A video was developed for our current Kindergarten Guidelines and has been extremely effective in the training process. Based on the costs of that video, we are requesting to use \$80,000 in unspent funding from Year 2 to create a similar video for training in the First through Third Grade Guidelines. An addendum to our current MOU with NIEER and the GSE at Rutgers would be used to accomplish this task. (See Project 2 budget narrative for details about unspent Year 1 funding.)

Budget Table: Project 10 – Kindergarten Entry Assessment

Budget Table: Project 10					
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$159,815.87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$159,815.87
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$159,815.87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$159,815.87

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 10 Budget Narrative

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

No grant funding is budgeted for Project 10. In-kind funding is provided by the DOE to support the costs of the NJ Kindergarten Entry Assessment (NJKEA). While Year 1 expenditures were lower than anticipated, the DOE did meet the target number of children participating in the KEA in 2014. The reason for the discrepancy in funding is due to a lower than expected per child cost for the assessment. Our RFP for the NJKEA was not yet settled at the time of our grant budget development, and actual per child costs proved to be lower than initially expected.

Project 10 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Due to the actual per child cost of the NJKEA (see above), we anticipate that annual in-kind costs for the NJKEA will continue to be lower than originally estimated in our grant budget.

Budget Table: Project 11 – Standards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 11 Budget Narrative

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

No Year 1 funding was expended for Project 11. Work is underway for the tasks included in Project 11; however, we underestimated the amount of time needed to accomplish them. As a result, all Year 1 funding for Project 11 will be transferred to Year 2.

In Year 2, we will add Approaches to Learning to our Kindergarten Standards, and then have all of our Standards aligned from Birth to Grade 3. The aligned Standards document will then be translated into Spanish and printed in both English and Spanish. We still intend to create self-paced modules for our Infant/Toddler Standards, but will start this work once our alignment is completed.

The Family Engagement Committee of the NJ Council for Young Children is in the process of developing our Family Engagement Standards. Stakeholder groups are now providing feedback on the draft, which will then be put into a family-friendly format. We expect to complete this work in Year 2 as well.

Project 11 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Aside from transferring Year 1 funding to Year 2, we do not currently anticipate making any changes to the tasks funded within Project 11, or the amounts projected for those tasks.