Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge

2015 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Georgia

JUNE2016

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

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

Georgia

2015

Due: February 29, 2016

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

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0713. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0713. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3E320, Washington, DC 20202-6200.

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Annual Performance Report
Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

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

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

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

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

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

D(1) Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and Progression of Credentials

D(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in Improving their Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities.

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

E(2) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A130039
2. Grantee Name Office of the Governor, State of Georgia
3. Grantee Address 203 State Capitol

City: Atlanta

State: Georgia Zip: 30334

4. Project Director Name: Kristin Bernhard

Title: Deputy Commissioner for System Reform

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

Email: kristin.bernhard@decal.ga.gov

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2015 To: 12/31/2015

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? (●) Yes ( ) No

b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? (●) Yes ( ) No

c. If yes, provide the following information:

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

Approving Federal agency: ☐ ED ☑ HHS ☐ Other Specify other:

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

Executive Summary

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

In 2015, the second year of implementation, the state continued to use the Race to the Top- Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) opportunity as a mechanism to build and improve the state's strong early education system. Examples include using Early Learning Challenge funds to increase subsidy opportunities for programs thereby increasing the number of children with access to high quality programs, expanding training and professional development opportunities for teachers and program leaders, and increasing the use of data and research for quality improvement. In the second year, the state more than doubled the number of programs rated in the Georgia's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and made considerable progress on the cross-agency data system and kindergarten readiness assessment.

As in Year One, the successes were created and continued through purposeful stakeholder engagement and appropriate and meaningful use of data. All of Georgia's accomplishments were aligned with other early education initiatives, including an early education subcommittee charged with making recommendations to the Governor's Education Reform Commission and planning for the 2016-18 Child Care and Development Fund Reauthorization. Research and data continued to inform policy and practice.

While the Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL) serves as the lead agency for Early Learning Challenge, the state's success is due to the continued collaboration with other state agencies and stakeholders. The increase in Quality Rated Participation is partially attributed to the partnerships between the state and philanthropic organizations that raise money for bonus packages and communication plans. Additionally, the strong partnership between DECAL and Great Start Georgia (the state's home visiting model) is evidenced in the incorporation of home visiting into child care centers. Year Two implementation of Georgia's RTT-ELC grant demonstrates the state's commitment to its youngest learners and meeting Early Learning Challenge goals.

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

Building Successful State Systems

- ***Governance Structure*** - The Governance Structure for the grant remained the same. The Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL) is the lead agency for the grant. DECAL also houses the state's Child Care Licensing System, Georgia's Pre-K program, Head Start Collaboration Office, and Quality Rated. In addition to administering those programs, DECAL also oversees the childcare subsidy program (CAPS) and the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP). Within DECAL, grant activities are coordinated through the System Reform division.

- ***Governor's Education Reform Commission*** - In 2015, the Governor created an Education Reform Commission, which included an Early Education Subcommittee charged with making recommendations that would increase access to high quality. Many of the recommendations build on Georgia's Early Learning Challenge work such as providing tax incentives related to quality and the implementation of a statewide communication strategy around quality.

- ***Implementation of the Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs)*** - In Year Two, the state saw the rollout of several key initiatives in the E3Zs, which are four, targeted regions of the state with high numbers of children with high needs. In each of the four E3Zs, "Birth to Eight Teams" of local stakeholders met regularly throughout Year Two. The Birth-Eight teams attract committed stakeholders from multiple early childhood fields of work, and oversaw the rollout of key professional development, technical assistance, family engagement, and child care subsidy initiatives in their region. DECAL also partnered with the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA) to design and award the Child Care Expansion Grant to encourage the establishment of new high-quality early learning programs in the E3Zs.

High Quality Accountable Programs:

- ***Increasing the Number of Higher Quality Programs*** - In 2015, the state doubled the number of programs

receiving a one, two, or three star rating from the prior year. At the time of the state's Early Learning Challenge application, approximately 230 programs had been rated, and by the end of 2014 that number had risen to 424. By December 31, 2015, 882 programs had achieved a one, two, or three star rating. Additionally, the state met the 90-day period from portfolio submission to observation 100% of the time.

- ***Transition to the ECERS-3*** - The state has successfully transitioned to the Early Childhood Rating Scale-Third Edition (ECERS-3). This transition included statewide communication with programs about the new scale and offering training to resource and referral agencies. The transition officially occurred September 1.

Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children:

- ***Expanding the Use of the GELDS*** - In 2015, Georgia made considerable progress in promoting the use of the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS). DECAL promoted targeted stakeholder understanding of the GELDS through increased print resources and lesson trainings as well as broader stakeholder awareness for families. DECAL developed new, high-quality training modules available through in-person and online avenues.

- ***Convening a Comprehensive Assessment Task Force*** - In Year Two of the Early Learning Challenge Grant, Georgia built upon the structure of the state's comprehensive assessment task force, provided enhanced professional development on assessment to early learning providers, and continued to partner with the developers of the Survey for the Wellbeing of Young Children (SWYC) to implement developmental screening.

- ***Creating Additional Family Engagement Opportunities*** - Georgia made progress on engaging and supporting families during Year Two. The final meeting of the Family Engagement Task Force took place at the beginning of Year Two. The taskforce, with support from the BUILD Initiative, created and printed a summary report describing the taskforce process, outcomes, and recommendations. The state also began the process of implementing the Great Start Georgia (GSG) framework and evidence-based home visiting in the Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Z). Child care learning centers meeting specific quality standards were recruited to participate as “hubs” for First Steps Georgia as the centers partook in intake screening, parent education, child development screening, and linkage to resources and services.

- ***Supporting Family, Friend, and Neighbor Care*** - DECAL created a funding opportunity called the Family Engagement Opportunity Grant in late 2015. The purpose of the Family Engagement Opportunity Grant was to Increase the availability and accessibility to quality family engagement programs, activities, and opportunities; to provide supplemental educational outlets that promote, encourage, and support community awareness and advocacy, and to provide access to free, ongoing parent leadership and child development resources in one or more of the Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs) and/or in the Metro Atlanta area.

Great Early Education Workforce:

- *Supporting Early Educators* - The state began developing extensive training around the Georgia Professional Development Hierarchy (GPDH). This training includes a coaching project with the University of Florida. Additionally, participation in the DECAL Scholars program has exceeded expectations. Over 50% of the awards have gone to a CDA's. This participation is fulfilling a critical gap in Georgia's workforce.

- *Revising the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework* - In Year Two, the state made gains to align professional development opportunities to the state's workforce knowledge and competency framework. DECAL also entered into a contract with a facilitator to support the overall revisions to the Workforce Knowledge and Competencies (WKC). The state employed a collaborative approach to these revisions by engaging stakeholders in this process to ensure a more comprehensive and inclusive vetting process. The state convened a work group to develop and implement workforce competencies for home visiting staff in Year Two.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress:

- ***Quality Rated Validation*** - The state continued the formal validation process. This includes continuing the on-going analysis of Quality Rated data to inform policy and practice. In 2015, the state awarded a contract to Child Trends, Inc. for an external research study that will examine the relationship of Quality Rated to other measures of quality and children's development.

- ***Developing the Kindergarten Entry Profile*** - The state made considerable progress in the development of a Kindergarten Readiness Assessment. In spring 2015, the first iteration of the formative assessment was piloted in Georgia Pre-K classrooms with a second iteration piloted in Kindergarten in the fall. Expanded pilots are planned in spring and fall 2016 with full implementation by fall 2017. The state has begun developing teacher training around the assessment.

- ***Creating the Cross-Agency Child Data System*** **(CACDS)** - The state continued the development of Phase One, and progress was made around data matching and the identification of data elements from participating state agencies.

Lessons Learned and Strategies Going Forward

In the first year of implementation, the state took longer than anticipated filling key positions. All of the positions were filled in Year Two. However, this change in personnel/structure created additional needs for project alignment and integration. Having positions filled at the project level did not necessarily allow for cross-project integration. Therefore, the state is working on establishing better communication within the Early Learning Challenge funded projects and personnel, as well as about the Early Learning Challenge grant to the general public and key external stakeholders.

While the state has been successful in recruiting programs for Quality Rated, the state's TQRIS, the “early adopters” and “high flyers” have now been recruited. Therefore, in Year Three, the state will expand efforts to recruit specific types of providers, including local school systems and family child care providers. Additionally, the state is continually examining and revising the methodology for estimating workforce. Through this examination, it is clear that there is a need for additional data for the workforce.

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

Successful State Systems

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

Governance Structure

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

Governance and administrative and fiscal oversight of Georgia's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant is grounded in Bright from the Start: Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL). In addition to the RTT-ELC grant, DECAL administers major federal and state programs, including Georgia's Pre-K Program, the Head Start State Collaboration Office, Quality Rated (Georgia's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System), child care licensing, the Child Care Development Fund child care subsidy program, the Child and Adult Care Food Program, and the Summer Food Service Program. In 2015, DECAL was also named a state recipient of an Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership Grant, which builds upon the state's early childhood system reform agenda established by the RTT-ELC grant.

Kristin Bernhard, Deputy Commissioner for System Reform at DECAL, continues to serve as grant manager for Georgia's RTT-ELC. In April 2015, DECAL hired a full-time communications specialist to support public awareness of Georgia's grant implementation. Other leadership and key staffing positions have remained constant.

Georgia's Key Governance Stakeholders:

The Georgia Children's Cabinet, chaired by Georgia's First Lady Sandra Deal, is composed of the heads of all state agencies that serve the needs of Georgia's children from birth to age 18 and of select community, philanthropic, education, and business stakeholders. The Cabinet also serves as Georgia's State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care. During Year Two of the grant, the DECAL Commissioner provided the Cabinet with formal updates on the implementation of the grant's 12 projects every six months, providing opportunities for the state's leaders on child policy to provide input and feedback on grant implementation.

The Commissioner of DECAL sits on the Alliance of Education Agency Heads (AEAH), composed of the heads of all education departments in the state. The other members of the Alliance include the Chancellor of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, State School Superintendent, President of the Georgia Student Finance Commission, Commissioner of the Technical College System of Georgia, Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Student Achievement, Executive Secretary of the Professional Standards Commission, and the Governor's Education Policy Advisor. The Alliance received formal updates on the implementation of the grant's 12 projects from the Deputy Commissioner for System Reform every six months.

Part of Georgia's governance structure also included establishing an Implementation Team, composed of key staff members from Participating State Agencies ultimately responsible for successfully implementing one of the 12 projects in Georgia's RTT-ELC grant. The cross-agency implementation team meets monthly to review progress on the state's scope of work, troubleshoot any challenges, and ensure collaboration across grant projects.

In 2015, RTT-ELC Advisory Committees for each grant project continued to meet. These advisory committees, composed of stakeholders such as ELD family and center providers, ELD teachers, technical assistance providers, community and business leaders, higher education faculty, staff from other state agencies, and philanthropic organizations met either monthly or quarterly to provide strategic guidance on their respective grant project. DECAL also named a formal Quality Rated Advisory Committee to guide the standards revision process for its TQRIS, Quality Rated.

Over the second year of the RTT-ELC grant, DECAL built upon the foundation established in Year One for both leading and managing grant execution for Georgia. In Year Two, the state focused on deepening stakeholder engagement at all levels, increasing public awareness to support grant implementation, and began planning strategically for sustainability.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

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

Stakeholder Involvement in the Early Education Empowerment Zones

Stakeholder involvement has been the cornerstone of Georgia's Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs). As written into Georgia's Early Learning Challenge Grant, the E3Zs were designed to contain approximately 10,000 children living in conditions of high need, where the state would then utilize the RTT-ELC grant to layer in additional funding and supports. In 2014, Georgia carefully selected the E3Zs using a two-phase collaborative process with community partners. In October 2014, E3Z Community Commitment celebrations were held in each of the selected zones, officially launching the work in each area. In Year Two of the grant, full-time community coordinators were in place in each E3Z to facilitate the work.

Throughout 2015, the community coordinators established or built upon local Birth to Eight teams and were trained in research methods and facilitation practices critical to job duties. All E3Z Community Coordinators participated in Implementation Science Framework overview training given by the National Implementation Research Network in early March, 2015, and the E3Z Community Coordinators, E3Z Business Operations Specialist, E3Z Director, and selected local Birth to Eight to Team leaders attended a Community-Based Participatory Research Training in April, 2015. Three of the four teams set a local vision for collaborative work as an outcome of the April, 2015 Community-Based Participatory Research training.

Monthly Birth to Eight Team meetings of local stakeholders occurred regularly in each zone throughout Year Two. DECAL continually assessed the composition of the local Birth-Eight Teams throughout Year Two of the grant to ensure consistent stakeholder participation. The Birth-Eight teams attract committed stakeholders from multiple early childhood fields of work, including: Family Support; Early Learning; Advocacy; Health, Mental Health, and Nutrition; and Special Needs and Intervention. The attendance of DECAL Child Care Services, Inclusion, Pre-K, and Quality Rated staff from local communities has added an additional layer of support to Birth to Eight groups. Regional CCR&R Directors report on Quality Rated participation status in each Birth to Eight meeting in order to generate support of the state's TQRIS among community leadership. Additionally, two subgroups within the Birth to Eight teams emerged during Year Two. Great Start Georgia Home Visiting subgroups met monthly or bimonthly in early 2015 to plan and write proposals for the development and implementation of evidence-based home visiting in a child care center hub, and Directors Network groups, focused on professional development and quality improvement practices, formed in three of the four zones.

To support the stakeholders in the E3Zs in Year Two, DECAL partnered with the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA) to design the RTT-ELC funded Child Care Expansion Grant. These grants, designed to encourage the establishment of new high-quality ELD programs in the E3Zs, would provide packages of funding to cover teacher salary subsidies and equipment costs for highly rated child care programs to expand in the zones. The application was posted on the Department of Community Affairs website: www.dca.ga.gov/E3Z . DCA and DECAL together provided training on parameters of Child Care Expansion Grant opportunity. Review of grant applications for round one of grant funding, resulting in the awarding of two programs - one to expand in the North Georgia Zone, and one to open a new Child Care Learning Center in the Clarke County Zone. At the end of Year Two, the state held “In the Know” training sessions in December, 2015 in three of four zones for

round two of grant funding, which will close on February 5, 2016.

Finally, evaluation of the Early Education Empowerment Zones' stakeholder involvement and implementation of grant initiatives remained a cornerstone of the project in Year Two. The first quarterly report of E3Z activities through July 31, 2015 was posted on Governor's Office of Student Achievement (GOSA) website in October, 2015 (http://gosa.georgia.gov/race-top-early-learning-challenge-grant-evaluation) and plans to post quarterly evaluations have been made until the completion of the Early Learning Challenge grant.

Stakeholder Involvement Across Other Grant Projects

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

- External Quality Rated Validation Team
- Kindergarten Entry Profile Development Teams of Pre-K and Kindergarten Teachers
- Quality Rated Focus Groups for Child Care and Technical Assistance Providers
- Child Care Resource and Referral Agency Focus Groups
- ECE Teacher Teams for GELDS Resource Development
- Comprehensive Assessment Task Force

Additional Stakeholder Involvement Opportunities

In Year Two, the state hosted four public policy forums in geographically diverse areas of the state to raise awareness about the results of an economic impact study of the child care industry in Georgia, commissioned by DECAL. The study found that the early child care and education industry in Georgia generates $4.7 billion in economic activity annually while creating more than 67,000 jobs statewide. Furthermore, the early care and education industry serves more than 337,000 children each year, including 143,000 children ages birth through three years, over 118,000 four year olds and almost 75,000 school-age children (5 to 13 years). All of Georgia's approximately 6,000 licensed and regulated child care providers were asked to complete a survey in the fall of 2014. The University of Georgia developed and distributed the survey and compiled the data. Georgia State University then analyzed the data which formed the basis for the final report.

To draw attention to the results from this unique study, DECAL partnered with the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education, the Georgia Early Education Alliance for Ready Students (GEEARS), the University of Georgia, and Georgia State University to host public policy forums at four locations around the state. Drawing from legislators, business leaders, early childhood education providers, and community leaders, in all, over 500 stakeholders registered to attend the policy forums. These policy forums provided an opportunity to inform the public about the importance of the early care and education industry, and also to present them with targeted opportunities to remain engaged in the state's system building work.

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

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

In early 2015, Governor Nathan Deal convened an Education Reform Commission to study and make recommendations to improve the state's funding formula for education. To ensure that access to early education was a focal point of the Commission, the Governor appointed an Early Education Subcommittee. While the subcommittee included members of the Reform Commission, other stakeholders (child care providers, advocacy organizations, etc.) specifically involved in early education in Georgia were also invited to participate. The subcommittee began meeting in February 2015 and was chaired by the Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL) Commissioner Amy Jacobs.

The ultimate goal of the subcommittee was to provide recommendations for the Education Reform Commission to consider and ultimately present to the Governor. The goals focused specifically on Georgia's Pre-K program and increasing access to high quality early care and education, as defined by the state's TQRIS, for children from birth to three years old. The subcommittee met throughout the year, ultimately forwarding the

following recommendations to the Reform Commission, which were unanimously passed in November 2015. The following recommendations will be considered by the state legislature in the legislative session beginning in January, 2016:

- Increase the start-up funds for new Georgia's Pre-K classes from $8,000 to $12,000 per classroom and increase operating funds by 5% to 8%.
- Develop a pay structure for Georgia's Pre-K lead teachers based on experience and teacher credential. Further study is needed by DECAL to develop teacher effectiveness measures and compensation models that would be feasible and reliable across multiple program types.
- Increase the pay for Georgia's Pre-K assistant teachers.
- Reduce class size to 20 children with a lead and assistant teacher.
- The state should appropriate funds for demonstration grants to select Georgia's Pre-K Programs for supporting effective instruction for dual language learners.
- The state should appropriate funding to increase the subsidy rates for Quality Rated providers to more closely align with the true cost of tuition.
- The state should appropriate funding to at least match private dollars raised to support a comprehensive marketing and public relations campaign to promote awareness of Quality Rated and the importance of high quality early learning.
- By December 2016, DECAL should develop a timeline in which child care programs must be Quality Rated to receive child care subsidy funds.
- The state should appropriate funds to support the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in early learning programs.
- Enact legislation to create a refundable consumer tax credit for families when their children are enrolled in a Quality Rated child care program. Tax credit should be tiered based on star level.
- Enact legislation to create a business investment tax credit for child care providers who are Quality Rated. Tax credit should be tiered based on star level.
- Enact legislation to create a refundable occupational tax credit, based on teacher credentials, for teachers who are employed at a Quality Rated child care program. Tax credit should be tiered based on star level.

The Education Reform Commission's full report containing all of the approved recommendations may be found at: https://gov.georgia.gov/sites/gov.georgia.gov/files/related_files/document/FinalGovERCReport_121415.pdf/. All of the recommendations of the Early Education Subcommittee and the Education Reform Commission would strengthen implementation of Georgia's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge agenda and support sustainability of the grant's initiatives in the state.

Participating State Agencies

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

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

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Quality Rated, Georgia's tiered quality rated and improvement system, launched in 2012 and continues to be the catalyst for the state's ambitious reform agenda. Early education programs in Georgia receive a rating based on a portfolio score (structural quality) and an observation score (process quality). Both the portfolio and the observation are based on a statewide set of tiered program standards.

Quality Rated continued to grow in Year Two both in child care programs in the process of being rated, and in child care programs that have received a star rating. In Year One, substantial revisions were made to the enrollment process, renewal process, paperwork required for a portfolio score, and to the Quality Rated Policy Manual. In Year Two, revisions to Quality Rated were based on expanding communication strategies, piloting new initiatives within Quality Rated that were focused on key population groups, and updating the observation measure used for preschool classrooms to the third edition of the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-3). Throughout the year, small enhancements were made to the Quality Rated Program Manual. Both the Quality Rated Policy Committee and the validation committee that were established in Year One continued to meet in Year Two.

The following describes revision efforts started or completed in Year Two:

Communication – The state moved forward with an expansion of communication efforts. This expansion included hiring a full-time communication specialist, establishing the Quality Rated Advisory Committee made up of stakeholders, and developing a statewide marketing campaign. The latter is being done in conjunction with external stakeholders and includes private and philanthropic funding. The full-time communication specialist was hired in May. The Quality Rated Advisory Committee held its first meeting in November 2015. The marketing campaign was developed throughout the year with a rollout planned for the spring of 2016. The campaign includes television, radio, and online advertising, along with an expanded social media presence.

Piloting New Initiatives Focused on Key Population Groups – In Year Two, the state made great strides in adopting or expanding Quality Rated in three key areas.

1. **School-Age Only Programs** – DECAL regulates many programs that provide care for school-age children. This includes some programs that serve only school-age children. Many of these programs had requested an opportunity to participate in Quality Rated. Therefore, DECAL began a pilot where school-age only programs were observed using the School-Age Care Environment Rating Scale (SACERS) and the portfolio was revised to better meet a school-age population. The pilot was completed in the fall of 2015, and programs will begin receiving ratings in early 2016. Additionally, DECAL is using the pilot to create a school-age designation for providers who serve both early childhood and school-age populations.

2. **Programs Serving Children with Disabilities** – DECAL created a process where two and three star programs may receive an “inclusion” designation (QRi). To receive the designation, programs have to score at a certain level on the Inclusive Classroom Profile. Technical assistance is provided through one of DECAL's Inclusion Coordinators. The QRi process was developed and recruitment began in 2015. The first set of inclusion designations will be awarded in the first half of 2016.

3. **Georgia's Pre-K Programs in Local School Systems** – The state continued efforts to adapt Quality Rated for Georgia's Pre-K programs in local education agencies. Many times there is only one or two classrooms in a public school and four-year olds are the youngest age

group served. DECAL recruited programs and began a pilot in Year Two. Revisions to include local school systems in Quality Rated will be developed in Year Three.

Transitioning to ECERS-3 – One of the successes of Year Two of the grant has been the transition from the ECERS-R to the ECERS-3. Communication and training began early in Year Two, and the state officially transitioned to the ECERS-3 in September 2015. Programs who submitted their portfolio between September 1, 2015, and December 31, 2015, were given a choice of being observed with the ECERS-R or the ECERS-3. Programs who submit after January 1, 2016, will be observed with the ECERS-3. All of the state's child care resource and referral technical assistance providers have been trained in the ECERS-3, and the state developed a cadre of reliable observers ready to conduct observations by September. Additionally, the state is participating in an Institute of Education Sciences grant that is validating the ECERS-3, enabling DECAL to collect additional data and train additional staff persons.

As mentioned previously, the state continued in efforts to engage stakeholders, adopt policies and practices that ensure alignment between Quality Rated and other programs, and create continual opportunities for research-to-policy (and policy-to-research) feedback loops. Efforts to engage stakeholders included meetings with key advocacy and philanthropic groups, engagement of an external validation committee, monthly birth-to-eight team meetings in the Early Education Empowerment Zones, additional focus groups (including families), and the establishment of the aforementioned advisory committee. The monthly meetings of the Quality Rated policy meetings along with the weekly meeting of the internal validation team ensured alignment with Quality Rated and other programs and the research-to-policy feedback loops.

In summary, while Year One focused on revisions related to enrollment and renewal policies, the Year Two revisions focused on expanding Quality Rated's reach and transitioning to the new ECERS-3 observation instrument.

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

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

In Years One and Two of RTT-ELC, the state has made significant progress in recruiting programs to Quality Rated. Recruitment to Quality Rated is done primarily through the state's resource and referral system, although all DECAL program consultants (licensing, Georgia's Pre-K, and infant/toddler) have access to information about Quality Rated and have been trained on recruiting providers. Furthermore, DECAL has continued working with external stakeholder and advocacy groups about the importance of Quality Rated and will begin a public relations campaign in 2016 to encourage families to ask about Quality Rated.

As noted in Table (B)(4)(c)(1), the state ended the year with 2,443 programs participating in Quality Rated. While that is an increase of 689 programs from the previous year, it is 290 less than Year Two targets. Georgia's 2015 target was based on 2013 provider population numbers. Since 2013, Georgia, like other states, has seen a decrease in the number of eligible programs. The number of licensed child care and family child care homes has been steadily decreasing since the Great Recession began. Georgia's 2015 Economic Impact Study found that while the state has been decreasing in numbers of programs, the average number of children being served in a child care facility has been increasing. In other words, fewer programs are serving more children per program.

While the actual number of programs participating is less than expected, the state is meeting its targets in terms of the percent of eligible programs participating. The 2,443 programs participating represents 40 percent of eligible programs. The target of 2,734 represented 41 percent of eligible

programs in 2013. Thus, while the state has not met the actual targets, the state has very nearly met the target for percentage of programs participating.

It is important to note that recruitment efforts with licensed child care centers are going as planned. At the end of 2015, 52 percent of licensed centers were participating. However, recruitment of family child care homes has gone slower than expected. DECAL is working with each of the state's resource and referral agencies to ensure that they are employing adequate resources dedicated to recruiting family child care. In the one resource and referral agency with a team specifically allocated for family child care providers, the targets are being met.

Year Three recruitment efforts will include the aforementioned public relations campaign geared towards families, continual monitoring of recruitment measures for the resource and referral agencies, and new recruitment efforts through DECAL's licensing division. Additionally, the state will expand efforts to recruit family child care programs by working specifically with the CCR&R's dedicated family child care staff and resources.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)
In the table, provide data on the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in the State's TQRIS by type of Early Learning and Development Program. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

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

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

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows										
Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 4										
Describe:										
Other 5										
Describe:										
Other 6										
Describe:										
Other 7										
Describe:										
Other 8										
Describe:										
Other 9										
Describe:										
Other 10										
Describe:										

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

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

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

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

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows															
Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS															
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
Other 4															
Describe:															
Other 5															
Describe:															
Other 6															
Describe:															
Other 7															
Describe:															
Other 8															
Describe:															
Other 9															
Describe:															
Other 10															
Describe:															

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

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

State-funded preschool: Statewide and Quality Rated participating Georgia's Pre-K program counts are actual (2015-2016 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2015).

Early Head Start and Head Start: Number of programs in the state is actual, from the Head Start Centers Locations Datasets as of December 2015 (http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/data/center-data). Number of programs in Quality Rated is actual at the end of 2015 to the best of our knowledge; however, Early Head Start and Head Start site data do not match perfectly to Georgia's early learning provider data, and some assumptions have to be made regarding a program's Head Start status.

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

IDEA, Part B, section 619: In the 2015-2016 school year, Georgia's Pre-K programs are using IDEA Part B, section 619 funding to place a special education teacher in 141 inclusion classrooms statewide, and 34 of these are in Quality Rated participating programs; these counts are actual (Georgia's Pre-K program data, December 2015). The Georgia Department of Education reports 1,001 schools use Part B, section 619 funding for preschool special education (October 2015 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System [FTE 2016-1]). Based on information later received from the Georgia Department of Education, a more accurate baseline count is that there were 984 schools with preschool special education services in October 2013 (FTE 2014-1), not 431 as originally reported.

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

CCDF: Actual count of programs participating in Quality Rated out of total programs that received a CCDF subsidy payment for services to children in November or December of 2015 (Maximus data system, 2/9/2016).

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

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

State-funded preschool: The main reason for not meeting this target is the state is in the process of determining the best way to rate Georgia's Pre-K programs located in public schools. In 2016, the state will complete a pilot that will inform this process. Based on the results from the pilot, the state will develop a strategy that will greatly increase the number of Georgia's Pre-K programs in public schools enrolled in Quality Rated.

IDEA, Part B: In 2016, DECAL will work with the Georgia Department of Education to determine the most accurate count of programs eligible and the best process for supporting these programs enrolling in Quality Rated.

CCDF: The state barely missed this target. As part of Georgia's 2016-2018 CCDF State Plan, subsidy rates will be significantly increased beginning in October 2016. Tiered reimbursement rates will also be increased, especially for two and three star programs. It is expected that the increased rates will be an incentive for more programs receiving CCDF to enroll and to pursue higher star levels.

Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application). The State has made progress in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that (please check all that apply):

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

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

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

At the time of the state's Early Learning Challenge application, approximately 230 programs had been rated, and by the end of 2014 that number had risen to 424. By December 31, 2015, 882 programs had achieved a one, two, or three star rating. Representing a major success for the state, DECAL has more than doubled the number of Quality Rated child care programs in a single year. Furthermore, the current number does not include 51 programs that have been rated but did not score high enough to achieve a one, two, or three star rating. The number does not include programs that have been re-rated. Thus, the number of programs that have actually gone through the rating process is 933. It is important to note that the state has met the 90-day period from portfolio acceptance to observation 100 percent of the time.

While the state made substantial progress in rating programs, the number falls short of the application target of 1,789 rated programs at the end of Year Two. Several reasons explain why the state did not meet the targets:

- The streamlined revisions for Quality Rated were not implemented until the fourth quarter of 2014. It is taking many programs longer than 12 months to go through the Quality Rated process. Therefore, the impact of the streamlined changes has not been fully realized. Considering the large increase in the number of programs between 2014 and 2015, it is expected that there will continue to be an increase in the number of programs rated in a single year.
- One of Quality Rated's foundational principles is that programs determine when they submit

their portfolio, and there is no time limit within which programs must submit. Many programs have elected not to submit until they are confident they will be rated a two or three star. While part of DECAL's message has been that just being rated signifies to families a commitment to quality, many programs are still hesitant to submit.

- The number of programs that have gone through the process but have not scored high enough to receive a rating has increased. This is expected considering that many of the state's higher quality programs were more likely to join Quality Rated in the beginning. This trend is supported by data measuring the percentage of programs at each level during different time periods. The percentage of ratings at the three-star level was greater during the first year and a half of Quality Rated.

In Year Three, DECAL is addressing the above challenges through the following strategies:

- In 2014, DECAL incorporated portfolio submission measures into the contracts with child care resource and referral (CCR&R) agencies. Georgia's CCR&R agencies provide technical assistance to child care programs that are in the process of becoming Quality Rated. The CCR&Rs have been able to begin meeting these measures through better use of data, creating new technical assistance processes that simultaneously meet the needs of multiple providers, and incorporating a teamwork approach.
- DECAL is working with the CCR&R agencies to better individualize the technical assistance offered to child care programs going through the rating process. This includes focusing less on the portfolio and more on the process. DECAL has hired a staff member whose sole responsibility is working with the CCR&Rs on enhancing their technical assistance approach.
- DECAL has dedicated specific resources to child care programs who did not achieve a rating. In many cases, it is the scores in a child care program's infant and toddler classrooms that lower its overall rating. Because of this trend, DECAL began offering specific technical assistance from its infant and toddler consultants to these child care programs. Consultants are targeting programs that did not achieve a star rating, and programs that receive technical assistance from infant and toddler consultants will have the opportunity to be re-rated at the conclusion of the technical assistance process.
- DECAL has worked with additional communication resources on the messaging related to Quality Rated. As detailed in earlier sections, this includes the implementation of the Quality Rated Advisory Committee and the development of an integrated and comprehensive Quality Rated marketing campaign.

Georgia has implemented a strong process for measuring quality in child care programs. This process includes portfolio submission followed by an independent, on-site observation. The state more than doubled the number of rated programs in Year Two, and the state will continue to increase the number of programs rated each year. The state has and will continue to implement strategies to meet the ELC targets.

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

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

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

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

While the state made efforts across all five policies and practices in Year Two, the state focused its RTT-ELC investment in training and technical assistance and financial incentives. The creation of Quality Rated, Georgia's tiered quality rating and improvement system, was based on the work of a large stakeholder committee that identified high standards for early education in the state and a research study that measured programs' ability to meet those previously identified standards across a representative sample. Therefore, those standards at the highest level (three stars) are those that state experts deemed as important and were shown to be both ambitious and achievable for providers.

Distribution of Rated Programs

In Georgia's RTT-ELC application, the state forecasted the percentage of child care programs that would be rated at each star level. Specifically, the state provided estimates based on the breakdown at the time of the application (38% one star, 35% two stars, and 27% three stars), with an increase in the percentage of one-star programs and a decrease of two- and three-star programs, assuming that higher quality programs were earlier adopters and based on percentages found in the 2009 statewide representative study of quality. The following data percentages detail the breakdown, by column, the actual percentages at the time of the state's RTT-ELC application, the forecasted percentages for 2014, the actual percentage as of 2014, the forecasted percentages for 2015, and the actual percentages 2015. It is important to note that the breakdowns combine both child care learning centers and family child care homes.

		Forecasted '14,	Actual '14,	Forecasted '15,	Actual '15
One Star	38%	46%	25%	44%	33%
Two Star	35%	42%	46%	40%	47%
Three Star	27%	11%	29%	15%	19%

As the table demonstrates, rating distributions are moving closer to the level of initial estimates (though those estimates may have overestimated the number of one-star programs while underestimating the number of two- and three-star programs.). In Year Two, the percentage of one-star programs has increased while the percentage of three stars has decreased. Considering that the state rated many more programs in 2015 and that the early adopters were of higher quality, this movement is to be expected.

The forecasts also assumed that there would be movement of some rated programs to higher star levels. These forecasts imply any of the following: 1) early adopters are higher quality and initial ratings cannot be used to predict the state; 2) the technical assistance process is helping programs

enter the rating system at higher levels; 3) the quality of early care and education has substantially improved since 2009; 4) programs will be able to move up star levels with continual technical assistance; or 5) a combination of the above.

As detailed in the subsequent section, Quality Rated validation efforts are designed to "tease out" the reasons for the distribution. The state is currently conducting different analyses and subsequent validation processes will help answer this question.

Efforts to Improve Quality

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

1. **Training and Technical Assistance -** the state continues to offer providers extensive training and technical assistance to assist in improving quality. Most training around Quality Rated is conducted by Georgia's six Resource and Referral Agencies (R&Rs). In Year Two, DECAL hired an RTT-ELC funded position specifically to work with the R&Rs to ensure that training is consistent across the state. The state also provided the R&R's training around the ECERS-3. This will help the R&R's in preparing childcare programs for the transition to the ECERS-3 while improving the quality of those classrooms.
2. **Financial Incentives -** the state expanded the use of financial incentives for programs to improve quality, both those funded by CCDF funds as well as RTT-ELC funds. While Tiered Reimbursement had been instituted in 2013 with CCDF funds, the number of programs participating increased in Year Two, in large part because of the RTT-ELC investments in training and technical assistance to help providers achieve and maintain higher quality levels. This expansion is expected to increase in Year Three as the state is substantially increasing the base amount offered to providers while greatly increasing the tiered percentages offered to one, two, and three stars respectively. In addition to offering tiered reimbursement, in Year Two, the state launched the RTT-ELC funded Quality Rated Subsidy Grants. The first round of the grants began in July 2015 with a second round offered in November. These grants pay approximately at the 90th percentile with providers agreeing to meet higher standards of quality. The state also used RTT-ELC funds in Year Two to launch a tiered family co-pay initiative, lowering the amount families who receive child care subsidy pay out of pocket when they select programs that have higher ratings in the state's TQRIS. The tiered family co-pay initiative is specific to the state's Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs).

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

Performance Measures (B)(4)(c)(1)
In the table below, provide data on the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

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

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

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.

Georgia's TQRIS has three tiers. Count of Quality Rated participants and their rating levels as of December 31, 2015, from Quality Rated data system. Since these data are maintained in the TQRIS data system (e.g., a program is not at tier 3 until it is assigned that level within the data system), no further data collection methodology is required other than retrieving the data from the data system. In addition to star-rated programs in the three tiers reported above, 300 programs were to be rated in the first quarter of 2016, 63 programs had gone through the rating process but failed to earn a star level, and 1,198 participating programs were in varying stages of the process to prepare for a rating, for a total of 1,561 additional participating programs who are enrolled but not yet rated.

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.

When the state submitted its ELC application the targets were based on the number of eligible programs at that time. In the past two years, the number of eligible programs has decreased by more than 1,000. Thus, while the state did not meet the actual target number, the percentage of eligible programs participating is very close to the target (one percentage point off).

Nevertheless, in 2016, the state will continue to develop new recruitment strategies. This will include a specific recruitment strategy for family child care homes and school age programs. Additionally, the recruitment of Georgia's Pre-K programs located in public schools and the increase in tiered reimbursement (effective October 1, 2016) for programs receiving CCDF funds should facilitate the state meeting its targets.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS

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

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows										
Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 3										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 4										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 5										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 6										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 7										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 8										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 9										
~~Describe:~~										
Other 10										
~~Describe:~~										

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

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

Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	50,496	1,800	3.6%	46,227	3,454	7.5%	46,198	5,252	11.4%						
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program														
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	25,396	520	2%	23,682	2,671	11.3%	24,541	6,603	26.9%						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	7,519			8,185			9,213								
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	8,974			9,481			9,752								
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	60,858	1,236	2%	61,278	4,075	6.7%	55,674	6,179	11.1%						
Other 1															
Describe:															
Other 2															
Describe:															

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows															
Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS															
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
Other 3															
Describe:															
Other 4															
Describe:															
Other 5															
Describe:															
Other 6															
Describe:															
Other 7															
Describe:															
Other 8															
Describe:															
Other 9															
Describe:															
Other 10															
Describe:															

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

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

State-funded preschool: Georgia's Pre-K is a universal program, not targeted to special populations, and does not collect child income data nor home language data. The total number of children with high needs in Georgia's Pre-K is an estimate based on counting all enrolled children who were marked as having an IEP, having limited English proficiency, or participating in a means-tested benefit, as reported by grantee programs to the state (2015-2016 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2015). This count, while actual, is only approximate to the definition of children with high needs. By this method, it is estimated that 57.4% of all Georgia's Pre-K students are children with high needs. PeachCare, Georgia's Child Health Insurance Program, was removed from the means-tested benefit data collected by Georgia's Pre-K beginning in the 2013-2014 school year because it was decided that its relatively higher income threshold (235% of the federal poverty level at the time, and since increased to 247% of the federal poverty level) did not best identify children from low-income families. As a result, the highest possible benefit eligibility that was counted for Georgia's Pre-K students dropped from 235% of the federal poverty level to 185% for students in school systems (free and reduced lunch) and 149% for students in private programs (Medicaid). This explains why the number of children with high needs served in Georgia's Pre-K appears to have dropped from the baseline.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Total served in the state is actual count of funded enrollment (Program Information Report, 2015). Children in top tiers of quality is an estimate based on the funded enrollment of apparent Head Start and Early Head Start programs with two or three stars at the end of 2015. Some assumptions have to be made matching Head Start sites to Quality Rated and licensing data, such as whether programs with a similar, but not identical, name or address in the Head Start Program Information Report and in Quality Rated program data are indeed the same program. The statewide funded enrollment reported here does not correspond to the total in Table (A)(1)-3a because funded enrollment is not available by age; therefore, cumulative enrollment is reported there.

IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619: Georgia did not submit (B)(4)(c)(2) performance measures for Part B or C on our original ELC application in 2013, with the following explanation: “Federal law prohibits IDEA Parts C and B funded programs from sharing information about children receiving services. Families are encouraged to share this information with their early learning and development programs but cannot be required to do so. Thus Georgia is unable to track participation in Quality Rated programs by children with IEPs and IFSPs.” The numbers reported in the actuals chart is the total number served statewide by Part B, Section 619, and Part C. Neither the actuals chart nor the targets chart reports numbers in top tiers of the TQRIS. The state has aggregate counts for how many children are served in IDEA statewide, but we are not able to identify these children within specific early learning programs. Part C statewide count is from December 1, 2015, federal data count. Part B, section 619 statewide count is from October 2015 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System.

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

CCDF: Numerator is number of children served in providers receiving a CCDF payment in November 2015 who were rated at 2- or 3-stars by the end of 2015; December child counts are lower due to time of year, whereas November counts are more typical. Denominator is average monthly served in calendar year 2015 (Maximus data system, 2/9/2016). The total is higher than in Table (A)(1)-3a because there were, on average, 19,277 children over the age of 5 served per month with CCDF funds. These are included here.

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

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

State-funded preschool: The main reason for not meeting this target is the state is in the process of determing the best way to rate Georgia's Pre-K programs located in public schools. In 2016, the state will complete a pilot that will inform this process. Based on the results from the pilot, the state will develop a strategy that will greatly increase the number of Georgia's Pre-K programs in public schools enrolled in Quality Rated. By including Georgia's Pre-K programs in public schools, the number of children with high needs enrolled in a two or three star Quality Rated program should increase. It is important to note that Georgia's Pre-K is a universal, not targeted, program. Results of the pilot will also provide data on the star level at which it is expected that Georgia's Pre-K programs located in public schools will enter.

CCDF: The increase in tiered reimbursement rates (effective October 1, 2016) should provide incentives for programs receiving CCDF funds to work on raising their star level. DECAL is also providing additional supports to help programs in raising their quality.

Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).
Describe progress made during the reporting year in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS during the reporting year, including the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality and assessing the extent to which changes in ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.

Since the development of Quality Rated, validation has been integrated into its day-to-day management and has become an integral part of its success. Over Year Two, Georgia has made significant progress on its Quality Rated validation efforts. This progress includes: 1) analysis of Quality Rated and other administrative data; 2) strengthening the research-to-policy feedback loops; and 3) designing and implementing an external validation study that will be used to gauge the extent to which Quality Rated levels correlate to other measures of quality and their relationship to children's growth and development.

Research Methods and Analyses

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

- Developing key validation questions and a timeline for addressing each question. This provides a validation roadmap that facilitates research-to-policy feedback loops and creates a systematic process for ongoing analysis of data.
- Conducting statistical analyses related to star-level distribution and participation rates. These analyses are revised and rerun as new data become available.
- Interviewing child care resource and referral agency directors about the newly implemented performance measures and evaluating if the performance measures are having the desired impact of reducing completion times.
- Aligning validation activities with other state early learning projects. For example, analyses related to access are being used in designing several activities in the Early Education Empowerment Zones.

Incorporation of Validation into Day-to-Day Activities

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

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

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

Both validation teams help facilitate feedback loops between research, policy, and practice. For

example, the internal team conducted analyses related to the potential impact transitioning to the ECERS-3. The findings and conclusions from these analyses were presented to the Quality Rated Policy Committee for recommendations for the transition.

External Research Study

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

Child Trends is assisting DECAL with its ongoing analysis of Quality Rated administrative data. Child Trends has worked with DECAL to develop a list of ongoing validation questions and a timeline related to how often each question will be answered and an analysis strategy for examining the data.

Child Trends will also conduct an external validation study. The study will look at how Quality Rated levels compare to other measures of quality and their relationship to child outcomes. The study will include different types of programs (e.g., child care centers and family child care homes) and different age groups (infants, toddlers, and preschool). The feasibility of including school-age children is also being reviewed.

The first year of the external study, which began in August 2015, is a pilot to prepare for a larger validation study with a representative sample in the following year. The pilot study will determine the feasibility of gathering child attendance and enrollment data and test a measure of the language and literacy richness of the environment. The pilot year study will also determine the best way to collect CLASS data in family child care homes, given that family child care homes often serve multiple age groups, and test teacher and provider-reported measures of social and language skills of infants and toddlers

In summary, during Year Two Georgia strengthened the validation mechanisms by employing a variety of research methods and analyses. This includes engaging in research related to Quality Rated using a variety of methods and statistical analyses, weekly and quarterly validation meetings, and commissioning a study to validate the star levels with other measures of quality and compare ratings to child outcomes. In Year Three, the state will continue with validation activities to inform further revisions to Quality Rated.

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

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

- [x] (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.
- [x] (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.
- [x] (C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.
- [x] (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.
- [x] (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- [x] (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.
- [x] (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

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

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

Early Learning and Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)
The State has made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards (check all that apply):

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

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

Throughout Year Two of the RTT-ELC grant period, Georgia has enlisted a variety of strategies to promote use of the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS). DECAL promoted more targeted stakeholder understanding of the GELDS through increased print resources and lesson trainings, as well as broader stakeholder awareness for families. For those stakeholders who needed support to implement the GELDS, DECAL developed new, high-quality training modules available both through in-person and online avenues. In Year Two, DECAL also sought to ensure that teachers were equipped to support the needs of dual-language learners (DLLs) and provided additional training opportunities meeting the needs of DLLs.

Increasing the Availability of Resources and High Quality Training

In 2015, DECAL developed and produced four different versions of the free GELDS Teacher Toolbox. Each GELDS Teacher Toolbox version targets a specific age developmental continuum (including a version for multiple age groups targeted to family child care providers) and includes thousands of standards-based activities, adaptations for children with disabilities, and tips for embedding technology and transitioning successfully between activities. Using Early Learning Challenge grant funding, DECAL printed 20,000 GELDS Teacher Toolboxes to be distributed free of charge to a variety of audiences. The state utilized an assortment of distribution channels to ensure relevant stakeholders both received a GELDS Teacher Toolbox and the accompanying professional development. 4,000 GELDS Teacher Toolboxes were shipped directly to Georgia's Pre-K classrooms at the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year. GELDS Teacher Toolboxes were also distributed to the Early Childhood Departments of each college in the Technical College System of Georgia. The Georgia Department of Education also purchased GELDS Teacher Toolboxes for teachers in special education pre-kindergarten classrooms. Remaining quantities were placed in an “e-store” maintained by DECAL that allows providers, teachers, families, and stakeholders to order a free GELDS Teacher Toolbox and only pay for shipping and handling.

Georgia also took steps during Year Two to ensure that teachers who received a free GELDS Teacher Toolbox also had access to free training opportunities on how to successfully use the GELDS Teacher Toolbox in their classrooms to support standards based instruction. Trainers from both DECAL and the state's Child Care Resource and Referral (CC&RR) agencies were provided with toolboxes and a corresponding trainer kit. Based on trainer feedback from the Year One Train-the-Trainer sessions on the GELDS, the course *Standards 104: Planning Lessons Using the GELDS* was revised during Year Two and extended from a 2-hour to a 4-hour training. The training offers an in-depth opportunity to discuss intentional lesson planning and to explore the activities in the Teacher Toolboxes. Standards 104 will be available statewide beginning in Year Three for all birth to five teachers and administrators.

In Year Two, DECAL also contracted with Georgia State University's Best Practices division to create a website to help teachers easily build and construct lesson plans with activities and lessons aligned with the GELDS. The GELDS aligned lessons and activities on the website will come from the GELDS Teacher Toolboxes

and will be included in a searchable database on the website that will be available in 2016. If a teacher would like more guidance about how to implement a certain activity, the website will also include video, audio, and graphic files to model the activity. Users will be able to build lesson plans by using a “drag and drop” approach. Users that create an account will be able to maintain a library of lesson plans, add their own activities, and create class rosters to support individualization within the lesson plans. The website is scheduled to launch in Year Three.

Finally, in Year Two Georgia also produced dual language resources for families on the GELDS. The GELDS Family Engagement Toolkit includes a growth chart, a shopping list complete with various standards-based activities families can engage in while shopping for groceries, and a pad of placemat activity sheets that include a wide range of standards-based activities for families to engage in while preparing or enjoying mealtimes. The resources were made available statewide and focused in the Early Education Empowerment Zones.

Supporting Dual Language Learners

In Year One, Georgia partnered with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium to incorporate the Early English Language (E-ELD) standards into the GELDS to provide a developmentally sound framework for supporting, instructing, and assessing dual language learners (DLLs), ages 2.5-5.5 years. In Year Two, the state offered two WIDA Master Cadre trainings, which were an opportunity for stakeholders to learn about WIDA's Early English Language Development Standards Framework and how to use these standards to support, instruct, and assess young DLLs (ages 2.5 to 5.5 years) in early education programs. The first Master Cadre program ended in July 2015 and 20 trainers are now able to deliver trainings based on the content learned in the program. A second Master Cadre began in September; participants should complete the program by March 2016 and then be eligible to conduct trainings based on the content.

In Year Two, WIDA also finalized a correspondence document between the GELDS and its Early English Language Development Standards. This document, *The Connection: Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards and WIDA Early English Language Development Standards,* is now available on both DECAL's and WIDA's websites.

Going forward, the state plans to re-engage the Steering Committee that supports the WIDA to work to increase the reach and efficacy of the WIDA partnership statewide. This steering committee will ensure sustainability of the work and help recruit participants for the enhanced professional development opportunities and institutes to be offered in the remaining years of the grant.

Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application)
The State has made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to (check all that apply):

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

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

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

Comprehensive Assessment Task Force

In the first year of the grant, the state established a Comprehensive Assessment Task Force, which continued to meet quarterly throughout Year Two and which will conclude its formal work in May 2016. After that time, the taskforce will function as a review body for further comprehensive assessment work.

In Year Two of the grant, the Comprehensive Assessment Task Force:

- Conducted a review of national best and promising practices for policies and programs to support a strong system of comprehensive assessment
- Developed, distributed, and analyzed a statewide survey on screening and formative assessment practices in early childhood education programs (e.g., child care and Head Start) and in state and community agency programs (e.g., Babies Can't Wait). Survey results were analyzed and the information will be used to formulate final recommendations.
- Formulated a set of principles to use in vetting assessment recommendations
- Created a draft set of recommendations on topics such as criteria to use in selecting assessment instruments, professional development to support professionals, linking education professionals to public health and medical professionals for an efficient system, sharing initial and follow up results, and supporting families in understanding their children's development. These recommendations will be used to inform statewide policies on training and assessment practices. The recommendations will be reviewed and finalized at the January 2016 meeting.
- Developed a draft Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) for signature by the leadership of the entities represented in the Task Force membership

Going forward, the task force will review and ratify a final set of recommendations in support of a comprehensive assessment system and identify resources for effective professional development to health and education professionals in Georgia. The task force will also finalize a summary report of its work to include best practices from local, state, and national level, as well as recommendations regarding which best practices the task force recommends. This summary report will then be distributed to a wide audience of state and community-level partners and families across the state to help support partners in implementing and supporting comprehensive assessment systems.

Professional Development on Assessment

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

educators on assessment. Georgia approved the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's free professional development module “Watch Me! Celebrating Milestones and Sharing Concerns” for child care continuing education credit through the Georgia Training and Trainer Approval System. Utilizing the state's Inclusion Specialist Network, DECAL disseminated information about the modules to early care and learning providers throughout the state. In Years Three and Four of the grant, DECAL will create tools for a wider distribution of “Watch Me! Celebrating Milestones and Sharing Concerns” and explore methods to incorporate the modules into other statewide professional development efforts such a Professional Learning Communities.

Implement Developmental Screening

In Georgia's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant application, the state proposed a pilot administering the Survey of Wellbeing of Young Children (SWYC), a new, freely-available, comprehensive screening instrument for children under 5 years of age. The SWYC was written to be simple to answer, to require 15 minutes or less to complete, and straightforward to score and interpret. However, delays in SWYC validation and development of supporting SWYC training materials from the instrument's authors has led DECAL to postpone piloting the instrument in Georgia's Pre-K classrooms. DECAL will begin this pilot when a SWYC training manual has been developed and the SWYC is able to be administered through an online system. Nonetheless, throughout Year Two of the Early Learning Challenge grant, staff from DECAL worked with staff from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention and Georgia's Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grant to develop the framework for a pilot for the implementation of the SWYC. Thus, when the critical resources from the authors are developed, DECAL will be ready to pilot the SWYC quickly.

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)
The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

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

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

N/A

GEORGIA DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA C(3) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION
PAGES 40 of 101 AND 41 of 101 HAVE BEEN DELETED

Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application)
The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

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

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

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

Family Engagement Task Force

In Year One of the state's RTT-ELC grant, DECAL created the Family Engagement Task Force to review and make recommendations on the ways to strengthen Quality Rated's structural quality standards on family engagement. The final meeting of the Family Engagement Task Force took place at the beginning of Year Two. The taskforce, with support from the BUILD Initiative, created and printed a summary report describing the taskforce process, outcomes and recommendations. These include a state definition of family engagement, a listing of Georgia specific family engagement strategies, as well as promising practices, recommendations for revisions, additions to Quality Rated's Family Engagement standard in a child care program's structural quality portfolio. The summary report was provided to all taskforce members and key state agency partners. A press release noting the work of the taskforce and a link to the report was issued. The report is available on the DECAL website at http://decal.ga.gov/documents/attachments/EarlyChildhoodGa-web.pdf .

Though the taskforce has been formally dissolved, it may be brought back together to review and provide feedback on particular issues and initiatives related to family engagement and for updates and input into policies and programs as needed.

Home Visiting Initiatives

Georgia began the process to implement the Great Start Georgia (GSG) framework and evidence-based home visiting in the Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Z). The Department of Human Services (DHS) is the lead agency on this activity for the RTT-ELC grant. In Year Two, the state held stakeholder meetings in each E3Z in order to design implementation strategies for home visiting within each of the four communities. Child care learning centers meeting specific quality standards were recruited to participate as “hubs” for First Steps Georgia intake screening, parent education, child development screening, and linkage to resources and services. The specific quality standards that programs had to meet were being rated in the state's TQRIS, Quality Rated, serving a high percentage of children receiving subsidies, serving infants and toddlers, and geographically located in high needs area within the community.

Throughout the first half of Year Two, technical assistance and training was provided for E3Z expansion sites to develop community plan outlines, proposals and budgets; to select the evidence-based home visiting model to use in the community, and to develop and implement the screening and referral protocols. Contracts were issued to three E3Zs hubs on April 1, 2015, with the final contract issued in July 2015. Direct service implementation for three out of the four hubs began July 2015, with the final hub beginning direct service on October 1, 2015. From direct service implementation through the close of Year Two:

- 77 families enrolled in the program

- 182 home visits were completed
- 47 total referrals were made to community resources
- 23 formal MOUs were entered into by local grantees with other local service agencies

The state also refined its management structure for the RTT-ELC funded home visiting expansion and participated in and convened in a variety of technical assistance opportunities for home visitors. In August 2015, the Great Start Georgia team convened the Annual Home Visiting Institute with the theme of "Family Engagement: Growing Partnerships Through Home Visiting." The Great Start Georgia Management Team, inclusive of DECAL, met twice-monthly throughout Year Two to ensure successful implementation. The success of the RTT-ELC funded home visiting was recognized when the Great Start Georgia Management Team attended the Pew Home Visiting Summit in May 2015 and was invited to present information about Georgia's RTT-ELC grant and the state's process for implementing evidence-based home visiting in partnership with child care programs in the E3Zs.

Community Based Grants

In its application, Georgia proposed to link Family, Friend, and Neighbor Caregivers with community Early Head Start/Head Start programs to share family engagement strategies, model family engagement practices, and deliver family engagement training. In order to expand the scope of eligible grantees to include non-profit and education agencies to more effectively reach the intended population and to deliver innovative services to families in high needs communities, DECAL created a funding opportunity called the Family Engagement Opportunity Grant in late 2015. The purpose of the Family Engagement Opportunity Grant was to increase the availability and accessibility to quality family engagement programs, activities, and opportunities; to provide supplemental educational outlets that promote, encourage, and support community awareness and advocacy , and to provide access to free, ongoing parent leadership and child development resources in one or more of the Early Education Empowerment Zones (E3Zs) and/or in the Metro Atlanta area. These grants sought programs with the purpose of supporting:

Advocacy: Empower parents and families as child advocates and leaders

Community Connection: Help families become well-connected to community resources and supports

Education: Strengthen families as child's primary educators and nurturers and increase families' knowledge of child development

Health & Safety: Support families as safe, healthy, and self-sufficient caregivers

DECAL began accepting applications for the Family Engagement Opportunity Grant on November 30, 2015. Training sessions on this grant opportunity were held in three of four E3Zs in December, 2015, and were held in Atlanta and in the Clarke County Zone in January, 2016. The deadline for application for this funding opportunity is January 22, 2016 and funding will be awarded in Year Three of the state's Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.
(Section D(1) of Application)
The State has made progress in developing (check all that apply):

☑ A common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes; and

☑ A common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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

In Year Two, the state made gains to align professional development opportunities to the state's workforce knowledge and competency framework. DECAL also entered into a contract with a facilitator to support the overall revisions to the Workforce Knowledge and Competencies (WKC). The state employed a collaborative approach to these revisions by engaging stakeholders in this process to ensure a more comprehensive and inclusive vetting process. DECAL also participated in peer-to-peer learning opportunities with other states (OR, CT, and NC) to gather lessons learned from their WKC revision work.

The state convened a work group to develop and implement workforce competencies for home visiting staff in Year Two. This will better align Georgia's home visiting program to the state's other early learning and development initiatives. The home visiting work group helped ensure that home visiting is overtly linked to the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS), Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework, and sufficiently meets criteria set forth in the Council for Exceptional Children/Division for Early Childhood competencies and in competencies for teaching dual language learners. Additionally, a career ladder for Home Visitors was approved by Great Start Georgia(Georgia's Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting grantee) and is awaiting implementation. These Early Learning Challenge supported advances ensure that home visiting staff have a similar blueprint for individual growth as their other early learning colleagues.

In Year Two, DECAL also held a system level meeting with state leaders of the University System of Georgia and Technical College System of Georgia to discuss a state level approach to ECE articulation. In Year Three, the state plans to host regional meetings between postsecondary institutions to reinvigorate and establish regional articulation agreements.

Perhaps most critically in Year Two, DECAL filled the Director of Professional Learning position after an extended search. This will provide the critical personnel infrastructure at the state system level to ensure measurable progress is made.

There were a few unanticipated challenges to the work in Year Two. First, The Director of Professional Learning position took much longer to fill than anticipated; since the Director will be leading the revision work as well as the articulation work outlined in the ELC grant, both projects have been delayed in their execution. Now that this position will be filled, the work on these projects will resume.

To ensure that continued progress is made on this work, the state has already begun to finalize and approve the competencies and career ladder for Home Visitors, as well as to incorporate the competencies and career ladder into the Georgia Professional Development Registry and Training Approval systems. The state has also begun plans to hold a kick-off meeting for the formal WKC revisions work, to schedule standing working meetings with writing teams, and to identify the subject matter experts to review the revised competencies.

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

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

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

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

The state made considerable progress in 2015 improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the early education workforce in Georgia. In Year One, DECAL established the AWARDS for early educators program (www.decalscholars.com) with Early Learning Challenge grant dollars to rewards early care and education (ECE) professionals for increasing higher early childhood education (ECE) credentials and degrees than the credential or degree they currently hold. Payments amounts are based on the credential/degree level. The utilization of this program by early childhood educators has exceeded expectations, with CDAs accounting for 50% of all awards paid to date. The high level of CDA awards suggests that AWARDS is filling a needed gap for entry level ECE credentials in the state. In Year Two, the state awarded $863,600 in stipends to:

- 413 educators who earned a Level 1 Credential (CDA or Technical Certificate of Credit)
- 147 educators who earned a Level 2 Credential (Technical Diploma or Associate Degree)
- 59 educators who earned a Level 3 Credential (Bachelor or Master Degree)

In Georgia's Race to the Top Early-Learning Challenge Grant application, the state laid out plants for a

four-tiered approach to Professional Development, called the Georgia Professional Development Hierarchy (GPDH), designed to move Georgia's early childhood educators from the knowledge phase to the high-performing application phase. The hierarchy starts with a broad audience of stakeholder groups and awareness-level content in tier one and becomes more targeted to early childhood educators teaching students birth to age five with focused content that supports high-quality teacher child interactions in the top tiers. As individuals move from tier to tier, professionals begin applying their knowledge of early learning and development to their own instructional approach with support from coaches and mentors. All levels of the hierarchy are embedded in the Workforce Knowledge and Competency (WKC) Framework.

In Year Two, the state concentrated on developing resources focusing on the top two levels of the GPDH. In 2015, DECAL contracted with the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning to support the design, build out, and testing of a training process that will prepare early childhood educators to lead professional learning communities (PLC) among their peers. In 2015, 58 participants completed the initial three day PLC Facilitator Training Institute, and the responses from participants have been overwhelmingly positive. The training process for this cohort will be completed by May 2016, with participants moving into a certification process in the fall of 2016.

In Year Two of the Early Learning Challenge grant, DECAL also began contract negotiations and planning with the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning to provide technical assistance on creating a coach designation that will be part of Georgia's Trainer Approval system. The technical assistance will support DECAL's development of the designation, including training processes, certification, rubrics, marketing, and communications. Due to delays in negotiating the contract, while the contract was fully executed in Year Two, this work been delayed until Year Three. A no-cost extension has been fully executed, and this work scheduled to be completed by June 2016.

Negotiating the contracts with vendors on both the PLC and coaching projects proved to be a very lengthy process. The work with University of Florida on the PLC project began approximately three months after initially planned. In Year Three, DECAL plans to finalize a contract with Clayton Early Learning to develop a Foundations of Coaching course which will be piloted in the spring and summer of Year Three for approximately 40 individuals. Clayton Early Learning provides national leadership to advance the field of early childhood education by researching, implementing and disseminating innovative teaching models.

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

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

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.					
Baseline and Annual Targets					
	Baseline	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	31	31	31	31	31
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	4,333	4,500	4,950	5,445	5,990

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	31	43	43		
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	4,333	5,546	5,339		

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

The Technical College System of Georgia awarded 2,427 technical certificates of credit, technical college diplomas, and associate degrees, and the University System of Georgia awarded 2,016 bachelor's, master's, specialist, and doctoral degrees related to early childhood education during the 2015 academic year, as reported by Georgia's statewide longitudinal data system (GA AWARDS). The Council for Professional Recognition reports 896 Child Development Associate (CDA) credentials awarded in fiscal year 2015 (10/1/2014 - 9/30/2015).

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

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

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

The state met its targets.

Performance Measures (D)(2)(d)(2):
In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for: Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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

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

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

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

Since the baseline was estimated by relying in part on prior studies that measured characteristics of the workforce through representative samples of early learning programs, and in the absence of a new study that might identify a change in credential levels, complete workforce data size and credentials by level were not available for Year One. Therefore Year One estimates were not provided.

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

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

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

As discussed in the data notes section, the state has received additional data on Georgia's early education workforce. The biggest change from the baseline to Year 2 is an increase in the number of estimated professionals and an increase in the non-credentialed workforce. The state is now able to report the percentage with the highest credential of a CDA. The biggest challenge for the state is to decrease the percentage of non-credentialed early childhood educators. As discussed in Section (D)(1), the DECAL Scholars program has proven to be more successful than anticipated. As Georgia continues to allocate more resources to this program, it is expected that the percentage of CDAs will increase (this has been the most popular credential earned with the program) and the percentage of non-credentialed will decrease. Additionally, Governor Deal has requested additional funds for Georgia's Pre-K teacher salaries. The increase in salaries should help retain teachers with master's degrees. The state will continue to examine the methodology used in computing workforce data and will develop additional strategies to address areas where the targets are not being met.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

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

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

In 2015, the state made great progress in the development of the state's Kindergarten Entry Assessment, the "Readiness Check." The Readiness Check will be a component of the Georgia Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (GKIDS). GKIDS is a year-long performance-based assessment aligned to the state's learning standards and is used as a formative assessment in all public kindergarten classrooms across the state.

The Readiness Check will provide formative assessment information during the first six weeks of kindergarten in order to equip educators, parents, and the state with high-quality information about individual student readiness so that appropriate supports and interventions can be established as needed. The Readiness Check is based on the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS), which include the following domains: 1) Physical Development and Motor Skills; 2) Social and Emotional Development; 3) Approaches to Play and Learning; 4) Communication, Language, and Literacy; and 5) Cognitive Development and General Knowledge. In Year Two, the state convened work groups, described in more detail below, to identify the specific GELDS domains and associated tasks for the KEP and to review data from Pre-K and Kindergarten classroom pilots.

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

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) is the lead agency in the development of the Readiness Check. In January of 2015, kindergarten teachers and representative from GaDOE and the Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL) participated in a Kindergarten Entry Profile (KEP) Development Committee to identify essential skills and concepts students should demonstrate upon entry to kindergarten. Skills and concepts recommended by the Development Committee were presented in an online survey to all kindergarten and Pre-K teachers statewide for agreement and comment. The Development Committee used the results from this survey

to inform the basis of the Readiness Check content.

In February and March, development committees consisting of Pre-K, kindergarten, and first grade teachers met with representatives from the GaDOE and DECAL to develop the assessment blueprint. The committees also reviewed activities and performance level descriptors. Both groups included teachers with certification and experience with dual language learners and students with disabilities.

From April through May of 2015, the state piloted small groups of activities across 60 Pre-K classrooms, including both public and private Pre-K classes, to obtain initial performance data of students who were close in age and school experience to those students who will enter Georgia kindergarten classrooms this fall. At least 200 students participated in each pilot activity. Student performance data and qualitative teacher feedback were collected during the pilot and usability review was conducted with a committee of teachers (Pre-K, kindergarten, and first grade). The committee reviewed performance data on all activities and made recommendations that informed further refinement of the KEP blueprint. The Pre-K pilot served as an item tryout and provided early information related to the usability and performance of activities in a setting that is similar to a kindergarten classroom.

During the fall of 2015, a sampling of students in 25 Georgia kindergarten classes participated in a field test of the revised Readiness Check activities during the first six weeks of the school year. Kindergarten teachers selected for the field test received face-to-face training from the GaDOE and the Georgia Center for Assessment prior to Readiness Check administration. Student performance data and qualitative teacher feedback were collected, and this field test data was reviewed by a committee of Pre-K, kindergarten, and first grade teachers. Revisions were made to several activities to clarify scoring rubrics and instructions for administration based on field test data and committee recommendations. Student performance data and teacher feedback collected during the field test will serve to inform next steps in implementation of the Readiness Check.

In Year Two of the Early Learning Challenge Grant, the state also deepened its commitment to provide high quality professional learning for Kindergarten teachers on the Readiness Check through the development online training modules. The Department of Education contracted with Georgia Public Broadcasting (GPB) for filming of students participating in Readiness Check activities. Video clips will be used in online training modules to demonstrate administration and scoring of the Readiness Check activities.

In fall 2016, the Readiness Check will be launched in a representative sample of kindergarten classrooms. A survey will be administered to all participating kindergarten teachers to receive feedback about the administration procedures and utility of the Readiness Check results for their classroom instruction. The results of the survey will inform the final refinement of all elements of the Readiness Check prior to the statewide launch of the Readiness Check in the fall of 2017. Once launched in 2017, the Readiness Check will assist kindergarten teachers in guiding and individualizing instruction for their students.

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

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

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

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

Prior to winning an Early Learning Challenge grant, DECAL had already begun construction of an early learning and development data system called the Cross Agency Child Data System (CACDS) to align with the state's Longitudinal Data System. In Year Two of the RTT-ELC, Georgia made significant progress in enhancing CACDS by deepening partnerships with the Department of Public Health (DPH), Department of Human Services (DHS), the Department of Education (DOE), the Governor's Office of Student Achievement (GOSA), and Head Start and Early Head Start grantees by maintaining strong data governance, further defining data elements, and began receiving pilot data from partners. To better support child care providers, the state also made strides in Year Two towards moving more provider facing services online, enhancing data systems to support professional development, and enriching online consumer awareness tools.

Strong Data Governance

In Year One, DECAL further delineated the governance structure of CACDS to include a defined hierarchy, a Data Management Committee, and to establish a Charter. In Year Two, once initial data elements were approved, the CACDS Data Management Committee began working on a CACDS Data Sharing Agreement and CACDS Use Policy. Each have been approved and are in use by all participating state agencies and Head Start and Early Head Start Grantees.

Defined Data Elements

In collaboration with the DECAL Research Team, criteria was developed to support identification of “Children with High Needs.” There were two primary elements identified:

- Low income: children who meet the Federal eligibility requirements for Early Head Start, Head Start, and CAPS programs
- Disabilities: children who meet the Federal eligibility requirements for IDEA Part C (Babies Can't Wait), IDEA Part B (619), and Kindergarten children with School District Individual Education Plans due to delayed learning.

In Year Two, CACDS began reviewing and matching pilot data from the following:

- IDEA Part C - Department of Public Health (Babies Can't Wait) from their system Babies Information and Billing System (BIBS)
- IDEA Part B - Department of Education from their Full Time Equivalent Fall data
- Vital Records - Department of Public Health from their Children 1st system

At this time there are clearly defined data elements for:

- IDEA Part C - Department of Public Health (Babies Can't Wait) from their system BIBS
- IDEA Part B - Department of Education from their Full Time Equivalent Fall data
- Vital Records - Department of Public Health from their Children 1st system for birth weight and birth order

The pilot data was reviewed and initial data mapping performed and person matching established. All work has been coordinated through the CACDS Data Management Committee. Year Three will focus on incorporating five years (2011 - 2015) of data from these source systems into CACDS and building reports, such as de-duplicated head counts for programs and information about IDEA C to IDEA B transfer by year.

Other State Data System Improvements

In Year Two, DECAL also built out additional phases of the Provider Self Service system, which included the initial rollout of the system with login and password maintenance for all providers including multiple owners, owner and site information updates, and license fee payments. In 2015, providers also began to be able to pay enforcement fines through Provider Self Service. Currently 80% of all provider ID's have been activated, and 92% of fees are being paid on-line. Child care program owners with more than two locations are able to pay online for multiple locations, which has greatly reducing manual processes on the part of DECAL staff. Online enforcement fine automation has reduced the backlog of overdue enforcement fines from 150 to 20.

In Year Two, DECAL also began the build out for the Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) Agency Call Center to collect data and directly populate the DECAL provider data system. This phase also includes a parent portal featuring an enhanced child care search functionality. While initially planned to roll out later in the grant period, the state believed it was important for our data strategy support the rapid increase of Quality Rated child care program participation in Georgia. This phase will help use data to ensure our CCR&R Call Center has the most up to date information about Quality Rated providers to share with consumers and stakeholders. Additionally, the state's new CCDF Plan includes requirements for a consumer education website, and the early completion of this phase will satisfy those CCDF Plan requirements.

Finally, DECAL also continued with the development of a Professional Development Portal and Training Registration System to support providers and the early childhood education workforce. Internal stakeholder meetings (Pre-K, Childcare Services, Quality Rated, Infant Toddler, and Child and Parent Services) have continued as desirable features in a Professional Development portal and a Training Registration System have been discussed. DECAL has been gaining consensus among the various divisions about the rules that will govern the system, and development of the system has been well underway and divisions have been doing usability testing. A public rollout strategy will be determined in early 2016.

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[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	69,571	53.89%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	141,673	53.89%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	219,417	53.89%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	430,662	53.89%

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

Data Table A(1)-1 Data Notes

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

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that 53.89% of children ages 0-5 in Georgia are in families with income less than 200% of the poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates).

According to the U.S. Census 2014 Population Estimates, the total number of children 0-5 in Georgia is 799,184, including 129,104 under age 1, 262,905 ages 1 and 2, and 407,175 ages 3-5 (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2015). Since low-income data are not available by single years of age, the number reported for each age group above is the total population multiplied by 53.89%.

Table (A)(1)-2: Special populations of Children with High Needs
The State should use these data to guide its thinking about where specific activities may be required to address special populations' unique needs.

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who…	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who…
Have disabilities or developmental delays[1]	18,965	2.37%
Are English learners[2]	123,084	15.4%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	0	0%
Are migrant[3]	3,428	0.43%
Are homeless[4]	35,768	4.48%
Are in foster care	7,950	0.99%
Other 1 as identified by the State		
Describe:		
Other 2 as identified by the State		
Describe:		

[1]For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).
[2]For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English.
[3]For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2).
[4]The term "homeless children" has the meaning given the term "homeless children and youths" in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).

Data Table A(1)-2 Data Notes
Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

All percentages are based on a Georgia 0-5 population of 799,184, following the U.S. Census 2014 Population Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2015).

Disabilities or Developmental Delays: 9,213 children ages 0-2 had an IFSP under IDEA Part C based on December 1, 2015, federal data count. 9,752 children ages 3 to kindergarten entry had an IEP at the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year under IDEA Part B, section 619 (Georgia Department of Education, October 2015 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System). Of the students served in IDEA Part B, section 619, Georgia's Pre-K reports 3,059 children with an IEP, 3.8% of all Pre-K students (2015-2016 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2015). Early Head Start and Head Start report a cumulative enrollment of 2,667 children (9.47%) with an IEP or IFSP (Program Information Report, 2015).

English learners: 15.4% of the population 5 to 17 years of age in Georgia speaks a language other than English at home, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, 2014 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates. This percentage has been applied to the 0-5 population, for whom these data are not reported. 7,432 Georgia's Pre-K students (9.2%) are identified by providers as having "limited language proficiency," defined as "difficulty speaking the English language" (2015-2016 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2015). 3,241 Early Head Start and Head Start enrollees (11.4%) have a primary language other than English (Program Information Report, 2015).

Migrant: 0.429% of kindergarten to grade 3 students in Georgia in 2014-2015 were eligible for the Migrant Education Program (Consolidated State Performance Report). This same percentage has been applied here to the 0-5 population, for whom eligibility is less comprehensively determined. Local education agencies report serving 1,188 migrant children ages 3

to 5 who are not in kindergarten and 597 migrant kindergartners in 2014-2015 (Consolidated State Performance Report), while Migrant and Seasonal Head Start reports a cumulative enrollment of 350 children (Program Information Report, 2015).

Homeless: The National Center on Family Homelessness (NCFH) uses the number of students identified as homeless by local education agencies (LEAs), as required by the McKinney-Vento Act, to estimate the number of homeless children ages 0-5, based on research estimating that 51% of all homeless children are under age 6 (*America's Youngest Outcasts: A Report Card on Child Homelessness*. [2014]. Waltham, MA: The National Center on Family Homelessness at American Institutes for Research. Pp. 99-101). In the 2014-2015 school year, LEAs in Georgia identified 34,365 homeless students in grades 1 through 12 (Consolidated State Performance Report). The 0-5 number estimated here follows the NCFH method and assumes the count for grades 1 through 12 represents 49% of all children. LEAs report serving 800 homeless children ages 3 to 5 who are not in kindergarten and 3,938 homeless kindergartners in 2014-2015 (Consolidated State Performance Report), while Early Head Start and Head Start report serving 593 homeless children (Program Information Report, 2015).

Foster care: Unique children ages 0-5 who were in foster care in 2015, with age calculated as of the child's first day in custody during the calendar year (Georgia SHINES data system, 1/13/2016).

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

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

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Infants under age 1**	**Toddlers ages 1 through 2**	**Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry**	**Total**
State-funded preschool			46,198	46,918
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program (4 year olds only)			
Data Source and Year:	2015-2016 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2015			
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	864	2,983	24,311	28,158
Data Source and Year:	Head Start Program Information Report, 2015			
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619	1,368	7,845	9,752	18,965
Data Source and Year:	Part C: Federal data counts, December 1, 2015; Part B: October 2015 Full Time Equi			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA				
Data Source and Year:				
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	2,789	13,733	19,875	36,397
Data Source and Year:	Maximus CCDF data system, 2015			
Other 1	437	404	169	1,010
Specify:	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Grant (MIECHV)			
Data Source and Year:	Georgia Home Visiting Information System (GEOHVIS), 2015			
Other 2				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 3				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 4				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 5				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 6				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				

Table (A)(1)-3a - Additional Other rows				
	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age			
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Infants under age 1**	**Toddlers ages 1 through 2**	**Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry**	**Total**
Other 7				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
Other 8				
Specify:				
Data Source and Year:				
[1] Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.				

Data Table A(1)-3a Data Notes

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

State-funded preschool: Georgia's Pre-K is a universal program, not targeted to special populations, and does not collect child income data nor home language data. The total number of children with high needs in Georgia's Pre-K is an estimate based on counting all enrolled children who were marked as having an IEP, having limited English proficiency, or participating in a means-tested benefit, as reported by grantee programs to the state (2015-2016 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2015). This count, while actual, is only approximate to the definition of children with high needs. By this method it is estimated that 57.4% of all Georgia's Pre-K students are children with high needs. PeachCare, Georgia's Child Health Insurance Program, was removed from the means-tested benefit data collected by Georgia's Pre-K beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. As a result, the highest possible benefit eligibility that was counted for Georgia's Pre-K students dropped from 235% of the federal poverty level to 185% for students in school systems (free and reduced lunch) and 149% for students in private programs (Medicaid). This explains why the number of children with high needs served in Georgia's Pre-K appears to have dropped from the baseline.

Early Head Start and Head Start (including Migrant and Seasonal Head Start) cumulative enrollment reported; Early Head Start and Head Start funded enrollment is not available by age. Program Information Report, 2015 state-level summary report.

IDEA, Part C: December 1, 2015, federal data count.

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia Department of Education, October 2015 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2016-1).

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

CCDF: Average monthly children served in calendar year 2015 by age (Maximus data system, 2/9/2016). CCDF also served, on average, 19,277 children over the age of 5 per month.

MIECHV: Children active during calendar year 2015 in Great Start Georgia home visiting programs (Georgia Home Visiting Information System, 2015). Other funding streams in addition to MIECHV were added in 2015 to support Great Start Georgia home visiting, including Early Learning Challenge funds.

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

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

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Number of Hispanic Children**	**Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children**	**Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children**	**Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American**	**Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children**	**Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races**	**Number of Non-Hispanic White Children**
State-funded preschool	9,928	75	1,509	21,113	55	1,537	11,981
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program						
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	4,876	28	191	19,382	66	1,157	5,774
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	301	12	264	2,964	8	1,917	3,747
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,407	21	299	3,347	9	323	4,346
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA							
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	2,206	183	83	44,373	88	1,723	6,876
Other 1	210	0	66	553	0	28	118
Describe:	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Grant (MIECHV)						
Other 2							
Describe:							

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

Table (A)(1)-3b - Additional Other rows							
Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Number of Hispanic Children**	**Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children**	**Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children**	**Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American**	**Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children**	**Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races**	**Number of Non-Hispanic White Children**
Other 3							
Describe:							
Other 4							
Describe:							
Other 5							
Describe:							
Other 6							
Describe:							
Other 7							
Describe:							
Other 8							
Describe:							

Data Table A(1)-3b Data Notes

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

State-funded preschool: 2015-2016 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2015. Totals here are for the 46,198 students identified as children with high needs. For all 80,519 students served, race and ethnicity is as follows: Hispanic: 12,970; non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native: 143; non-Hispanic Asian: 2,959; non-Hispanic Black or African American: 32,083; non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander: 114; non-Hispanic two or more races: 2,938; non-Hispanic White: 29,312.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Cumulative enrollment, Program Information Report, 2015 state-level summary report. Early Head Start and Head Start race and ethnicity data are reported separately in the Program Information Report and are not able to be aggregated into the federal education reporting categories. Therefore the Hispanic count is double-reported in the race categories as well (e.g., “Asian” is not exclusively “non-Hispanic” but may include Hispanic children). These counts include 217 pregnant women because the Program Information Report does not allow race and ethnicity to be disaggregated by age. In addition, the Program Information Report has counts by race for 925 “Other” and 852 “Unspecified.”

IDEA, Part C: December 1, 2015, federal data count

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia Department of Education, October 2015 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2016-1)

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

CCDF: Average monthly children served in calendar year 2015 by race and ethnicity (Maximus data system, 2/9/2016). Total includes 19,277 children over the age of 5 served on average per month. Total does not include 143 children on average whose families declined to report race and ethnicity.

MIECHV: Children active during calendar year 2015 in Great Start Georgia home visiting programs; race/ethnicity unrecorded for 35 children (Georgia Home Visiting Information System, 2015). Other funding streams in addition to MIECHV were added in 2015 to support Great Start Georgia home visiting, including Early Learning Challenge funds.

Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.
Note: For States that have a biennial State budget, please complete for all fiscal years for which State funds have been appropriated. We are not asking for forecasting, but for actual allocations. Therefore, States that do not have biennial budgets need not complete for years for which appropriations do not yet exist.

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

Table (A)(1)-4 - Additional Other rows					
Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	**Baseline**	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
Other State contributions 7	$155,000	$180,000	$220,000		
Specify:	Philanthropic contributions (Georgia Early Education Alliance for Ready Students [GEEARS]: sum				
Other State contributions 8	$1,914,438	$2,000,000	$1,553,000		
Specify:	Philanthropic contributions (Atlanta Speech School, Rollins Center for Language and Literacy: prof				
Total State contributions:	**$398,626,464**	**$421,163,616**	**$424,564,057**		

[1] Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.
[2] Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.
[3] Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

Data Table A(1)-4 Data Notes

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

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

In addition to the philanthropic funds included in the table, Georgia Family Connection Partnership reports $1,225,000 in awards received in calendar year 2015 to support Quality Rated, including awards from the Blank, Dobbs, Ellis, Fitzgerald, Rich, Tull, and Woodward foundations and from Chick-Fil-A, Georgia Power, Kaiser, and St. Mary's.

State contributions to IDEA Part C, Other State contributions 2, and Other State contributions 3 reflect carryovers from the 2014 baseline. Validated amounts for those sections could not be obtained at this time, but state investment in those sections either met or exceeded the baseline amounts in 2015. Other State Contributions 4 refers to a conference that was held in fiscal year 2013 but discontinued in fiscal year 2014.

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

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

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

Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program[1]					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Baseline**	**Year One**	**Year Two**	**Year Three**	**Year Four**
State-funded preschool *(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)*	50,496	46,227	46,198		
Specify:	Georgia's Pre-K Program				
Early Head Start and Head Start[2] *(funded enrollment)*	25,396	23,682	24,541		
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 *(annual December 1 count)*	16,493	17,666	18,965		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA *(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)*					
Programs receiving CCDF funds *(average monthly served)*	60,858	61,278	55,674		
Other 1	1,116	686	1,010		
Describe:	Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Grant (MIECHV)				
Other 2	7,519	8,185	8,185		
Describe:	IDEA Part C				
Other 3	8,974	9,481	9,481		
Describe:	IDEA Part B				
Other 4					
Describe:					
Other 5					
Describe:					
Other 6					
Describe:					
Other 7					
Describe:					
Other 8					
Describe:					

[1] Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.
[2] Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Data Table A(1)-5 Data Notes

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

State-funded preschool: 2015-2016 Georgia's Pre-K roster 2 program data, December 2015.

Early Head Start and Head Start: Program Information Report, 2015 state-level summary report. Early Head Start and Head Start funded enrollment is reported here, as requested. However, Tables (A)(1)-3a and (A)(1)-3b report cumulative enrollment because funded enrollment cannot be reported by age or by race/ethnicity.

IDEA, Part C: December 1, 2015, federal data count

IDEA, Part B, section 619: Georgia Department of Education, October 2015 Full Time Equivalent Data Collection System (FTE 2016-1)

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

CCDF: Average monthly children served in calendar year 2015 (Maximus data system, 2/9/2016). Total includes 19,277 children over the age of 5 served on average per month.

MIECHV: Children active during calendar year 2015 in Great Start Georgia home visiting programs (Georgia Home Visiting Information System, 2015). Other funding streams in addition to MIECHV were added in 2015 to support Great Start Georgia home visiting, including Early Learning Challenge funds. More recent data reveals that a more accurate baseline count would be 681 children active during calendar year 2013.

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

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

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

Data Table A(1)-6 Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

No changes in this table have occurred in Year Two.

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

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

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

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

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

Table (A)(1)-7 - Additional Other rows'					
Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System'				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
Other 6					
Describe:					
Other 7					
Describe:					
Other 8					
Describe:					

Data Table A(1)-7 Notes

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

No changes in this table have occurred in Year Two. Year One descriptions follow:

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

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

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

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

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

These elements are not currently required in CCDF.

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

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

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

Budget and Expenditures

Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

Georgia's actual expenditures include both spent and encumbered funds from Year Two. During Year Two, Georgia paid special attention to developing and implementing the systems needed to sub award funds to early learning programs, educators, and other key RTT-ELC funding recipients. While we believe this will ensure maximum sustainability of the system reforms of our RTT-ELC grant, it did create some delays in expending funds as initially planned.

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

Additionally, Georgia had unspent contractual funds in some projects because the state was able to effectively maximize previously awarded external technical assistance from a variety of sources. While this left the state with unspent Year Two funds, it will allow us to instead look at utilizing RTT-ELC funds to more effectively focus on direct implementation in Years Three and Four.

Though some projects may have overspent line item funds, every project still came in overall underbudget for the project budget.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

As detailed in the project budget narratives below, Georgia will submit amendment requests where needed to move all unexpended Year Two funds to carry over into grant Year Three to support project activities planned for 2016. While the state under-spent in year Two, Georgia is on track to catch up on spending in Year Three of the RTT-ELC grant.

Project Budget 1

Project Name: **Grant Management**

Project Budget Narrative

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

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

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

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

Project Budget 2

Project Name: Early Education Empowerment Zones

Project Budget Narrative

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

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

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

In its budget amendment, the state will rollover unspent line 11 funds to years three and four. Unspent personnel dollars that are unlikely to be spent in years three and four due to lower hiring salaries will be rolled into quality supports for the child care programs in the early education empowerment zones and into family engagement supports.

Project Budget 3'

Project Name: Quality Rated Access and Availability'

Project Budget Narrative

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

The major discrepancy between the State's budgeted and actual costs for Project 2 was in Personnel and Fringe Benefits, as well as Funds to be Distributed. RTT-ELC positions to support this project were hired at salaried under those anticipated in the budget narrative. Additionally, due to the longer than expected selection process for the Early Education Empowerment Zones, the contracts for child care subsidy and reduced parent co-pay in those regions were not able to launched until midway through Year Two, leaving a surplus in that budget field.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

DECAL will work with our program officers to submit the necessary amendments to carry over unspent funds in Year Two to support the Quality Rated subsidy contracts and reduced parent co-pay projects. The state will consider using unspent personnel dollars to add additional time limited staff to support the roll out of Quality Rated and its incentives to meet grant performance measures.

Project Budget 4

Project Name: Quality Rated Validation

Project Budget Narrative

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

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

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

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

Project Budget 5

Project Name: Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

Project Budget Narrative

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

The major discrepancy in Year Two occurred in personnel and associated fringe and travel. The Georgia Early Learning and Development (GELDS) Manager position remained vacant for much of the year. While staff time from other projects kept the initiatives and deliverables moving forward on time, the state struggled to find a qualified candidate to fill the position funded by this project. Spending remained low in the "other" line as well, due to printing and distribution costs for the GELDS teacher toolboxes and associated materials coming in under budget.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The state will fill the GELDS Manager position in Year Three and will roll forward unspent dollars across all budget lines to produce and distribute additional GELDS support materials.

Project Budget 6

Project Name: Comprehensive Assessment System

Project Budget Narrative

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

Though the principle contract for this project came in under budget, there were no major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no substantive changes anticipated to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year. DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent contractual funds forward across future years of the grant

Project Budget 7

Project Name: Statewide Family Engagement and Community Grants

Project Budget Narrative

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

There were no major discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year. The unanticipated funding for contractual funded staff to lead the training sessions initially budgeted for under the “other” line item.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

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

Project Budget 8

Project Name: **Center-based Home Visitation and FFN Care**

Project Budget Narrative

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

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

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

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

Project Budget 9

Project Name: Workforce Knowledge and Competencies

Project Budget Narrative

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

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

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

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

Project Budget 10

Project Name: Supporting Early Educators

Project Budget Narrative

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

The state had more early childhood educators take advantage of the AWARDS for early educators program, thus overspending in that budget line. Guidelines for the program have been revised so that funding will match demand in Year Three. Unspent Other funding was due to a delay in the need for printed guides and stipends that the state expects to pay out in Year Three.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

DECAL will work with our Program Officers to submit the necessary budget amendments to roll unspent funds forward across future years of the grant, and adjust future budget projections to align with what was spent in Year Two on the AWARDS for early educators program. The state may also move additional unspent dollars from other projects and prior years to support AWARDS given the demand from educators.

Project Budget 11

Project Name: Kindergarten Entry Assessment

Project Budget Narrative

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

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

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

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

Project Budget 12

Project Name: **Unified Data System**

Project Budget Narrative

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

DECAL was able to utilize other funding sources to cover some of the contractual costs initially planned for in Year Two.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

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

Project Budget 13

Project Name: _____

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

THE GEORGIA RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 12 PROJECTS.
PAGES 85-101 HAVE BEEN DELETED.

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

RTT-ELC Budget Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$468,848.00	$1,244,439.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,713,287.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$258,788.15	$742,795.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,001,583.15
3. Travel	$8,676.00	$115,582.00	$0.00	$0.00	$124,258.00
4. Equipment	$67,555.00	$9,200.00	$0.00	$0.00	$76,755.00
5. Supplies	$6,210.00	$7,877.00	$0.00	$0.00	$14,087.00
6. Contractual	$624,353.00	$2,643,020.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,267,373.00
7. Training Stipends	$746,300.00	$893,200.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,639,500.00
8. Other	$4,371.00	$18,429.00	$0.00	$0.00	$22,800.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$2,185,101.15	$5,674,542.00	$0.00	$0.00	$7,859,643.15
10. Indirect Costs*	$87,477.00	$123,850.00	$0.00	$0.00	$211,327.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	$166,167.00	$3,275,186.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,441,353.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$23,263.00	$101,938.00	$0.00	$0.00	$125,201.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$2,462,008.15	$9,175,516.00	$0.00	$0.00	$11,637,524.15
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$9,083,568.00	$8,530,740.00	$0.00	$0.00	$17,614,308.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$11,545,576.15	$17,706,256.00	$0.00	$0.00	$29,251,832.15

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$91,408.15	$123,534.00	$0.00	$0.00	$214,942.15
2. Fringe Benefits	$2,206.00	$8,020.00	$0.00	$0.00	$10,226.00
3. Travel	$3,928.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,928.00
4. Equipment	$492.00	$924.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,416.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$151.00	$0.00	$0.00	$151.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$1,946.00	$1,396.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,342.00
8. Other	$257,713.15	$339,938.00	$0.00	$0.00	$597,651.15
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$16,086.00	$23,600.00	$0.00	$0.00	$39,686.00
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.	$23,263.00	$101,938.00	$0.00	$0.00	$125,201.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$297,062.15	$465,476.00	$0.00	$0.00	$762,538.15
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$65,672.00	$82,560.00	$0.00	$0.00	$148,232.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$362,734.15	$548,036.00	$0.00	$0.00	$910,770.15
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.

Actual Expenditures for Project 2 - Early Education Empowerment Zones: Identify four empowerment zones for additional services for children with high needs and improve ELD infrastructure and quality in those areas					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$30,927.00	$158,161.00	$0.00	$0.00	$189,088.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$1,838.00	$27,035.00	$0.00	$0.00	$28,873.00
3. Travel	$14,638.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$14,638.00
4. Equipment	$1,490.00	$1,893.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,383.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$364.00	$0.00	$0.00	$364.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$364.00	$5,531.00	$0.00	$0.00	$5,895.00
8. Other	$106,389.00	$453,184.00	$0.00	$0.00	$559,573.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$13,442.00	$25,420.00	$0.00	$0.00	$38,862.00
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	$119,831.00	$478,604.00	$0.00	$0.00	$598,435.00
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	$119,831.00	$478,604.00	$0.00	$0.00	$598,435.00
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.

Actual Expenditures for Project 3 - Quality Rated Access and Availability: Revise Quality Rated Standards and create new incentives for providers to raise quality and parents to choose quality					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$33,508.00	$257,732.00	$0.00	$0.00	$291,240.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$2,844.00	$66,984.00	$0.00	$0.00	$69,828.00
3. Travel	$20,026.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$20,026.00
4. Equipment	$1,475.00	$1,632.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,107.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$1,307.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,307.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$1,217.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,217.00
8. Other	$115,461.00	$749,802.00	$0.00	$0.00	$865,263.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$36,761.00	$57,602.00	$0.00	$0.00	$94,363.00
10. Indirect Costs*	$162,142.00	$2,794,186.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,956,328.00
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	$314,364.00	$3,601,590.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,915,954.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$5,756,886.00	$4,765,188.00	$0.00	$0.00	$10,522,074.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$6,071,250.00	$8,366,778.00	$0.00	$0.00	$14,438,028.00
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.

Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Quality Rated Validation: Validate levels of quality and validate impact of Quality Rated on children's development and growth					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$15,543.00	$20,457.00	$0.00	$0.00	$36,000.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$992.00	$0.00	$0.00	$992.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$90.00	$1.00	$0.00	$0.00	$91.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$440,218.00	$0.00	$0.00	$440,218.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$92.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$92.00
8. Other	$43,132.00	$496,138.00	$0.00	$0.00	$539,270.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$3,490.00	$2,539.00	$0.00	$0.00	$6,029.00
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	$46,622.00	$498,677.00	$0.00	$0.00	$545,299.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$2,216,790.00	$1,636,476.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,853,266.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$2,263,412.00	$2,135,153.00	$0.00	$0.00	$4,398,565.00
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.

Actual Expenditures for Project 5 - Promoting Early Learning Outcomes: Develop training and resources for all stakeholders in the tiers of the professional development hierarchy					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$26,391.00	$9,889.00	$0.00	$0.00	$36,280.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$954.00	$1,993.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,947.00
3. Travel	$3,824.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,824.00
4. Equipment	$1,660.00	$2,295.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,955.00
5. Supplies	$371,855.00	$489,401.00	$0.00	$0.00	$861,256.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$600.00	$8,648.00	$0.00	$0.00	$9,248.00
8. Other	$463,690.00	$534,188.00	$0.00	$0.00	$997,878.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$6,565.00	$4,776.00	$0.00	$0.00	$11,341.00
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	$470,255.00	$538,964.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,009,219.00
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	$470,255.00	$538,964.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,009,219.00
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.

Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - Comprehensive Assessment System: Identify a set of common child assessmets with professional development and policy guidelines					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$14,497.00	$13,375.00	$0.00	$0.00	$27,872.00
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	$14,497.00	$13,375.00	$0.00	$0.00	$27,872.00
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	$14,497.00	$13,375.00	$0.00	$0.00	$27,872.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$18,489.00	$29,798.00	$0.00	$0.00	$48,287.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$32,986.00	$43,173.00	$0.00	$0.00	$76,159.00
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.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$12,124.00	$3,723.00	$0.00	$0.00	$15,847.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$101.00	$30.00	$0.00	$0.00	$131.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$75.00	$496.00	$0.00	$0.00	$571.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$10,200.00	$0.00	$0.00	$10,200.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$152.00	$2,524.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,676.00
8. Other	$34,108.00	$28,282.00	$0.00	$0.00	$62,390.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$2,273.00	$826.00	$0.00	$0.00	$3,099.00
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	$36,381.00	$29,108.00	$0.00	$0.00	$65,489.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$600,000.00	$600,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,200,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$636,381.00	$629,108.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,265,489.00
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.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$5,047.00	$2,610.00	$0.00	$0.00	$7,657.00
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	$14,000.00	$10,986.00	$0.00	$0.00	$24,986.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$1,042.00	$826.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,868.00
10. Indirect Costs*	$4,025.00	$481,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$485,025.00
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	$19,067.00	$492,812.00	$0.00	$0.00	$511,879.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$0.00	$150,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$150,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$19,067.00	$642,812.00	$0.00	$0.00	$661,879.00
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.

Actual Expenditures for Project 9 - Workforce Knowledge and Competencies: Revise Georgia's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and increase articulation between postsecondary institutions offering programs of study in ECE					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$49,185.00	$0.00	$0.00	$49,185.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$4,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$4,000.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$9,200.00	$0.00	$0.00	$9,200.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$500.00	$0.00	$0.00	$500.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$7,300.00	$0.00	$0.00	$7,300.00
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	$152,609.00	$0.00	$0.00	$152,609.00
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	$152,609.00	$0.00	$0.00	$152,609.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$67,576.00	$75,034.00	$0.00	$0.00	$142,610.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$67,576.00	$227,643.00	$0.00	$0.00	$295,219.00
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.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$14,517.00	$39,475.00	$0.00	$0.00	$53,992.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$733.00	$6,377.00	$0.00	$0.00	$7,110.00
3. Travel	$15,510.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$15,510.00
4. Equipment	$175.00	$9.00	$0.00	$0.00	$184.00
5. Supplies	$75,000.00	$79,241.00	$0.00	$0.00	$154,241.00
6. Contractual	$746,300.00	$893,200.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,639,500.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$238.00	$0.00	$0.00	$238.00
8. Other	$876,599.00	$1,083,510.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,960,109.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$4,200.00	$4,313.00	$0.00	$0.00	$8,513.00
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	$880,799.00	$1,087,823.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,968,622.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$0.00	$578,353.00	$0.00	$0.00	$578,353.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$880,799.00	$1,666,176.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,546,975.00
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.

Actual Expenditures for Project 11 - Kindergarten Entry Assessment: Augment Georgia's current formative assessment to implement a Kindergarten Entry Profile.					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$12,276.00	$47,773.00	$0.00	$0.00	$60,049.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$151.00	$0.00	$0.00	$151.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$120.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$120.00
5. Supplies	$31,257.00	$999,060.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,030,317.00
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	$70,986.00	$1,128,984.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,199,970.00
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	$70,986.00	$1,128,984.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,199,970.00
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$17,343.00	$250,708.00	$0.00	$0.00	$268,051.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$88,329.00	$1,379,692.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,468,021.00
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.

Actual Expenditures for Project 12 - Unified Data System: Expand the quantity and quality of data collected. Create entry points for providers to enter and use data. Facilitate greater family engagement by making data more readily available at the program and child level.					
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Grant Year 3 (c)**	**Grant Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$17,047.00	$30,256.00	$0.00	$0.00	$47,303.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$9,629.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$9,629.00
4. Equipment	$633.00	$127.00	$0.00	$0.00	$760.00
5. Supplies	$131,744.00	$602,403.00	$0.00	$0.00	$734,147.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$92.00	$0.00	$0.00	$92.00
8. Other	$188,526.00	$683,546.00	$0.00	$0.00	$872,072.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$3,618.00	$3,948.00	$0.00	$0.00	$7,566.00
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	$192,144.00	$687,494.00	$0.00	$0.00	$879,638.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$340,812.00	$362,623.00	$0.00	$0.00	$703,435.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$532,956.00	$1,050,117.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,583,073.00
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.