

Early Learning Challenge

2016 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



JUNE 2017





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

New Jersey

2016

Due: February 28, 2017

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

Paperwork Burden Statement

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



Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

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

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

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

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

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

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

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

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

E(2) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A130049

2. Grantee Name Office of the Governor, State of New Jersey

3. Grantee Address PO Box 001
City: Trenton
State: New Jersey Zip: 8625

4. Project Director Name: Vincent J. Costanza
Title: Executive Director

Phone #: (609)777-0567 Ext.: _____ Fax #: _____

Email: vincent.costanza@doe.state.nj.us

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2016 To: 12/31/2016

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): From: 07/01/2016 To: 06/30/2020

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.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The cross agency RTT-ELC team has continued to implement the eleven projects that our federal partners have approved in New Jersey's Scope of Work (SOW). After year three of implementation, the majority of tasks within each of the projects have been completed within the timeframes approved within the SOW. Amongst the various activities and tasks, the three initiatives below stand out as accomplishments.

Project 9: Preschool-3rd Grade Initiative

The New Jersey Department of Education, in partnership with Rutgers University, Graduate School of Education (GSE) and the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) have developed *First through Third Grade Implementation Guidelines* with funding provided by the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grant <http://www.state.nj.us/education/ece/rttt/k3/>. Furthermore, we have begun research on the implementation of these guidelines in twenty districts throughout the state <http://nieer.org/press-release/nieer-partners-20-new-jersey-school-districts-enhance-k-3-education>.

The purpose of this work is multifaceted. During the project, we aim to examine the classrooms in Kindergarten through third grade to have an aggregate look at the instruction in these grades. This information will be used to guide the professional learning opportunities offered through the Division of Early Childhood Education at NJDOE. The longitudinal look at classrooms will enable feedback on the impact of the professional learning provided to teachers.

Project 8: Data Systems

This past year has been a productive year for the data project as several project milestones and deliverables have been met or are in progress. The work that follows below is evidence that moving the data project from a year one challenge to a year two accomplishment is a warranted move.

Major accomplishments this year include:

- **Project Management:** Monitored and updated the NJ-EASEL Work Breakdown Structure through ongoing planning sessions to determine the activities which can be completed prior to the end of the grant period (12/31/2017). Determined it would be necessary to request a no cost extension for 2018 in order to complete the initial Phase 1 implementation. In addition, it is likely scope will need to be reduced and/or more resources will be required.
- **Data Governance:** Data Governance Plan (DGP) was fully executed by the four NJ-EASEL participating agencies. The DGP has been used as a key reference document by both the NJ-EASEL Steering Committee and the NJ-EASEL Policy & Data Governance Council over the past year. Two more of the four Data Sharing Agreements (DSA) between the participating agencies were fully executed (Multi-Agency Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Data Sharing, and DOE and DOH MOA for Data Sharing) which leaves one DSA in progress.
- **Requirements Definition & Analysis:** Completed Source Data Analysis Sessions for the remaining 5 Group 1 source systems. Focused on Data Mapping activities (mapping source system data elements to the Crosswalk of NJ-EASEL Questions and Objectives, and to NJ-EASEL Child Master Data, Programs and Events) and initiated Mockup Reports.
- **Design:** Completed additional Logical and Physical Data Model Designs and associated ETL Data Mapping for 2 NJ DOE systems. Continued Logical and initiated Physical Data Model Designs and ETL Data Mapping for 1 NJ DHS system. Initiated Integrated Design activities for Child Master Data.
- **Development & Testing:** Completed development of 2 of the 3 ETL Processes components for 2 NJ DOE systems and 1 component for 1 DHS system. Initiated development of the 3rd ETL Process component

for the 2 NJ DOE systems.

Project 6: Family Engagement and Health Connections

This project is one of the most robust projects in the grant as there are major activities spread through all of the participating state agencies. The following two activities have made significant progress over the last year.

The County Councils for Young Children (CCYCs) are established in all 21 counties in New Jersey. This statewide initiative is a collaboration with the New Jersey Council for Young Children (NJCYC), DCF, DOE, DOH and DHS. The CCYCs were created to strengthen cooperative collaboration between parents, families, and local community providers with health, early care and education, family support, and other service providers. The CCYC is a community organization for social service planning. This body of community members (e.g. parents, community residents and community providers), come together and receive training and technical assistance in parent leadership and shared leadership models. These approaches embrace and encourage parents/community residents to be active partners with service providers and community leaders. A list of the councils can be accessed here <http://www.state.nj.us/education/ece/njcyccounty/>.

The CCYCs have a direct link to the New Jersey Council for Young Children through the Family and Community Engagement Committee. Elected members of the CCYCs have participated in several Family and Community Engagement Committee meetings, provided guidance, and gave input on the development of the Family Engagement Standards, which is also an activity of RTT-ELC. All 21 CCYCs now have a designated coordinator and basic structure in place --Steering Committee, Health, Education and Safety Workgroups, and General Membership meetings. Committees/workgroups are co-led by community and parent stakeholders.

One way that these councils assist families to identify the needs, aspirations and successes of collective efforts to positively influence the health, education and well-being of children from pregnancy/birth to age eight is through training in the Strengthening Families Protective Factor Framework. The CCYC participants work together using the Strengthening Families Protective Factors Framework and the New Jersey Standards for Prevention Programs: Building Success through Family Support. This training is developed by the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect to engage parents and develop mutual goals and recommend creative strategies/solutions that respect the views and priorities of diverse families in the community.

Next, the NJ Department of Health expanded a core health component, Central Intake Hubs (CIH), to improve access for parents and families to needed infant/child health services and supports in all counties. Central intake provides families and providers with easy access for resource information and referrals to a wide range of local community services that promote child and family wellness, support health literacy between parents, health care providers, and early learning programs. The primary focus of central intake is to facilitate linkages from pregnancy to age five. However, all county sites will assist families and individuals with needed connections across the lifespan. Central Intake services are a collaboration between the New Jersey Departments of Health, and Children and Families, and the Department of Education. The primary focus of central intake is to assist pregnant women, parents and families with young children in accessing the most appropriate services in an efficient manner. Central intake works closely with partners to eliminate duplication of efforts and services, and maximizes the collective impact and appropriate utilization of available and often scarce resources.

During this current year of implementation, central intake has been successful in promoting services in communities by meeting with collaborating agencies and forming new partnerships. Successful Referrals, Resources, Appointments, (RRA'S) created for the current grant year was **10,358**. Central intake along with partnerships with the County Council for Young Children have been successful in bringing new partners to the table this year. These partners along with parents have been able to identify some barriers such as transportation, and long wait time for appointments.

LESSONS LEARNED

New Jersey entered this work with a structure in place that created the foundation to accomplish the work approved by our federal partners in the SOW. The Interdepartmental Planning Group (IPG) is the primary implementation arm for programs and policies affecting young children in the state. It includes the administrators (under the Commissioners) from each of the state's departments with oversight of programs and

services related to children from prenatal to age eight, and other relevant agencies. This group considers the feasibility of program and policy recommendations, makes plans for implementation, presents those plans to the various agency commissioners, and ultimately carries out the plans while working in close collaboration with all other relevant state organizations and agencies. Although New Jersey entered the RTT-ELC work in round three, we have been working at many of the projects for some time, because of this IPG structure. For example, Grow NJ Kids (GNJK) has been an IPG focus since the inception of the IPG. What is clear is that the work outlined in RTT-ELC would not have been possible without the strength of the *cross-agency relationship*, made manifest in the work of the IPG.

In addition to the relationship of the agency partners, making an early *commitment to human capital* by filling positions required in the grant as soon as possible has proven fruitful. For instance, we can attribute the year three accomplishments in Project 8: Data Systems to having dedicated staff that focus on and accomplish the requisite tasks. It is hard to imagine the administration of such an initiative without a team dedicated to the rollout and coordination needed for the work to be successful.

Lastly, an important lesson learned was the attention needed for *sustainability* issues early in the life of the grant. It is important to all partners, (agency partners and beyond) that we are not merely “four-year friends.” The work of the grant is extensive and needs significant planning to be sustained. Although the entire sustainability picture is not yet complete, we initiated a formal sustainability planning process in January 2017 and will produce a sustainability report in June 2017.

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

CHALLENGES

The largest challenge that New Jersey has faced in the third year of implementation is the timing of the sustainability planning. Initially, we had hoped to begin a formal process in the fall of 2016, but the planning was delayed because of difficulties securing an outside facilitator.

STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES

Despite the challenge listed above and the temporary delay that ensued, we are well on our way to planning for sustainability. Over the next six months, we will involve outside stakeholders as well as agency staff to develop a plan that follows the process outlined below:

- Designate Interagency Planning Team as leadership team for sustainability planning process (six meetings will be held in all)
- Created Sustainability Planning Group, consisting of lead project staff across all relevant agencies, to support the sustainability planning (two meetings will be held)
- Adopt Sustainability Framework to analyze all work:
 - Policy importance- how important is this effort from a policy standpoint?
 - Impact- what is the evidence of effectiveness?
 - Need- what is the critical, demonstrated need for the effort?
 - Progress to Date- what progress can we demonstrate?
 - Evaluation- do we have any evaluation data supporting the work?
 - Financing- how difficult will it be to gather financial resources for sustainability?
 - Organization- how difficult will it be to gather organizational resources for sustainability?
 - Human Resources- how difficult will it be to gather human resources for sustainability?
 - Support- what is the level of community support?
 - Support- what is the level of leadership support? (agency, statewide)
 - Vision- how does this project align with the vision?
 - Federally required/mandated- is this federally required/mandated
- Gather information on each project using the Sustainability Framework
- Conduct stakeholder survey
- Produce sustainability report in June 2017

DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES, THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

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).

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

Stakeholder Involvement

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

In order to support the implementation of RTT-ELC, the IPG established broad-based involvement of stakeholders (e.g., higher education partners and faith-based community). Such a diverse coalition is evidenced by the diverse listings of presentations delivered to various constituencies throughout the state during the third year of the grant. For instance, presentations were scheduled with major stakeholder groups, such as the New Jersey Association for the Education of Young Children, New Jersey Association of School Administrators, Public School Superintendents' Roundtables, Early Childhood Supervisors, New Jersey Head Start Association, New Jersey Presidents' Council, the New Jersey Faith-Based Advisory Council as well as various other stakeholder groups.

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.

N/A

Participating State Agencies

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

No changes in year three of implementation

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.

Over the past grant year, January 1, 2016-December 31, 2016, Grow NJ Kids started testing its rating process. The rating partner, William Paterson University, developed three (3) different rating readiness documents to meet the needs of providers as part of the QRIS. Specific pathways were created for NAEYC accredited programs and Early/Head Start Programs. Both took into consideration the current structures for accreditation and program monitoring. This re-enforced alignment with both program models and has encouraged participation by both program types. The rating process is both a portfolio review and onsite observation. A point system was developed for each level of the TQRIS and provides an opportunity for programs to implement systematic and systemic change.

Furthermore, the framework and processes of Grow NJ Kids has developed and efficiencies were created. The on-line enrollment went live in 2014, but technical issues occurred, which have been addressed. It is much easier for programs to enroll. In late 2015, Directors' Orientation was moved to an online format. This allows programs to go through the training in the comfort of their program. In July 2015, four (4) regional technical assistance centers were created. These centers are charged with providing intensive technical assistance based on the needs of the program. This has allowed for NJ to move to a multi-tiered approach to assist programs through the process more efficiently and effectively.

In addition, Grow NJ Kids entered into an agreement with Rutgers University, School of Social Work, Institute for Families to handle all logistical aspects of training related to Grow NJ Kids. The agreement took effect April of 2016.

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.

As of December 31, 2016, there were a total 1,111 center-based programs and family child care providers that have enrolled in Grow NJ Kids. Approximately 856 family child care providers are activity participating in Grow NJ Kids. Over the course of this past year, the Grow NJ Kids team has revamped directors' orientation and have developed a technical assistance protocol. In addition, the team has presented at regional provider meetings, conferences, and other events that early care and education providers participate.

Furthermore, Grow NJ Kids administrative team continues to encourage programs to move through the rating process. All pilot programs were required to provide details and timeline as to when they will move to ratings.

In addition, the technical assistance centers held regional quality showcases. This was a way to display appropriate classroom arrangements and provide additional professional development on a range of topics. All programs were invited to attend.

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	13	2.2%	132	22.1%	251	42%	370	62%	489	81.9%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	5	3.3%	38	19.2%	76	38.4%	114	57.6%	152	76.8%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	35	10%	70	20%	105	30%	140	40%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	26	1.1%	143	6.1%	260	11.1%	377	16.1%	494	21.1%
Other 1	0	0%	38	19.2%	76	38.4%	114	57.6%	152	76.8%
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs									
Other 2	1	1.8%	6	10.9%	11	20%	16	29.1%	21	38.2%
<i>Describe:</i>	Private Schools for the Disabled									
Other 3	0	0%	30	1.4%	80	3.8%	130	6.2%	180	8.6%
<i>Describe:</i>	Family Child Care Centers receiving CCDF funds									

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	11	0.5%	54	2.4%	99	4.4%	144	6.4%	189	8.4%
<i>Describe:</i>	Other licensed center and family child care sites									
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	597	13	2.2%	597	159	26.6%	597	130	22%	597	208	3,500%			
<i>Specify:</i>	State-funded Preschool (former Abbott)														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	150	5	3.3%	150	40	26.6%	150	68	45%	150	119	7,900%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	350	0	0%	350	11	3.1%	350	18	5%	350	22	600%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,342	26	1.1%	2,342	268	11.44%	2,441	241	9.8%	2,342	340	1,500%			
Other 1	198	0	0%	198	8	4%	198	7	4%	198	9	5,800%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs														
Other 2	55	1	1.8%	55	1	1.8%	55	0	0%	55	1	180%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Private Schools for the Disabled														
Other 3	2,100	0	0%	2,100	36	1.71%	1,587	45	2.8%	2,100	225	1,100%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Family Child Care Centers receiving CCDF funds														

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	2,258	11	0.5%	2,258	114	5.04%	3,934	196	5%	2,258	167	700%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Other licensed center and family child care sites														
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

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

State-Funded (former Abbott) includes special education programs and related services for children with disabilities funded through IDEA Part B and 619 funds and special education state funds. To prevent duplication these sites are not included in the count for IDEA Part B programs.

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

All early learning programs funded by Title I of ESEA are included within the State Preschool Program. Baseline data are estimated based on the Grow NJ Kids pilot.

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

In addition, since initial implementation, attrition has occurred. We have had 106 programs and family child care programs that have withdrawn or closed over the past 3 years.

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

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

In year three of the grant, the Grow NJ Kids team will continue to target outreach efforts towards the private schools for the disabled, Part B-619 programs, and other district programs. We have seen over year two of the grant the preschool expansion program and the Head Start Child Care Partnership programs enrolled. The team will continue to host regular informational session via webinar, attend conferences and director meetings.

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.

Although New Jersey has not conducted many ratings of programs using Grow NJ Kids, this past year we have had 19 programs rated.

Since the establishment of the MOU, university staff have been attending reliability training on the environmental rating scales and CLASS. In addition, rating readiness documents were created to support programs with identifying their level for ratings. Specific documents/pathways were created for NAEYC accredited programs and Head Start Programs. These documents are posted on www.grownjkids.com. Furthermore, the points system is also outlined and found on the website.

Based on feedback from the field, the original threshold scores for the ERSs were amended. In addition, since the changes in the early childhood environmental rating scale (ECERS-3), it was also determined that CLASS will not be used in the preschool classrooms. This will be revisited again in 2017.

Inter-Rater Reliability

- Grow NJ Kids includes a robust process for establishing and maintaining a inter-rater reliability.
- Administration of the environmental rating scales (ECERS-3 and ITERS-R) in 50% of the classrooms, in each age group, as appropriate.
- For family child care-the Family Child Care Environmental Rating Scale (FCCERS) will be used.
- Anchor Raters have been established and re-reliability will occur annually.
- As the demand for ratings increase, new raters will begin with a process of guided practice, which includes lessons on developmentally appropriate practices, reviews of completed assessments, and simulated ratings using video clips of real situations.
- In addition, new raters will complete at least three "reliability visits: in which both they and an Anchor Rater complete a full assessment. Over the course of the three visits the new monitor takes on increasing responsibility for facilitating the visit (i.e. by the third visit, the new rater conducts the interview).
- After each reliability visit, new monitors debrief and review scoring with the Anchor Rater.

- New raters must complete at least three visits in which their assessment scores are greater than 85% reliability with the Anchor Rater.
- All raters-including Anchors- are monitored for reliability over time to prevent deviation. Each monitor undergoes a reliability check on an annual basis, and any scores lower than 85% require additional practice assessments before returning to the field.

Rating Cycle: Official rating occurs at 3, 4, 5 star level. Once assigned a rating of 3 stars or higher, programs must be re-rated a minimum of once every three years. The rating assessments are free of charge; however, assessments will be limited to one free assessment per year.

Cumulative Statistics to Date (December 31, 2016)

Total Programs who requested ratings: 34

Total Programs ratings completed by NJCQR with written reports sent to GNJK: 19

Total Programs recommended for extension: 7

Total Programs currently moving through the ratings process: 14

Total Programs that applied, but were recommended by QIS/TA to not proceed: 1

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.

Grow NJ Kids is working on tracking trends and monitoring how programs are moving through the system of GNJK. As programs move through the system, we notice an increase in quality associated with the system of supports received by the programs. Furthermore, the state has developed a multi-layered technical assistance approach. Programs once they have completed the online orientation are assigned a Quality Improvement Specialist (QIS). The QIS will assist the program in orienting the staff to GNJK, enrolling the staff in the workforce registry, initial health and safety incentive requests based on needs identified by licensing, initial data gathering, and targeted coaching on the the ERS self-assessment completion. Once programs have done 3% or 2 classrooms, whichever is greater, with the assistance of the QIS, the program transitions to one of the four regional technical assistance centers . Once the transition occurs, programs with the support of their technical assistance specialists will do a deeper dive into the Grow NJ Kids standards.

This technical assistance approach will help ensure that measurable progress is made by the end of the grant period. The technical assistance centers will track performance outcomes, such as, increased ERS scores, implementation of curriculum, etc.

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	56	473	912	1,351	1,790
Number of programs in Tier 1	14	118	221	279	332
Number of programs in Tier 2	14	118	221	279	335
Number of programs in Tier 3	22	189	376	635	899
Number of programs in Tier 4	3	24	47	79	113
Number of programs in Tier 5	3	24	47	79	111
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					

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	56	428	633	1,111	
Number of programs in Tier 1	14	376	486	288	
Number of programs in Tier 2	14	52	147	806	
Number of programs in Tier 3	22	0	0	13	
Number of programs in Tier 4	3	0	0	0	
Number of programs in Tier 5	3	0	0	4	
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated				1,094	

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

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

The baseline numbers were estimated with the idea that more programs would have gone through the rating process at this point in implementation. While New Jersey has not conducted many ratings of programs using Grow NJ Kids in the first 3 years of RTT-ELC, William Paterson University, our rating partner developed the system and the pilot programs are currently testing it. Requirements and a point system have been developed. Rating Readiness was developed for all programs, including NAEYC accredited programs, and Head Start Programs, to assist programs in knowing when to proceed with the ratings process. The process has been completed by 17 programs out of 1,111 center-based programs and family child care providers, with an additional 13 in process.

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

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

Programs have been working on implementing their quality improvement plans. All pilot programs were required to submit for rating readiness or provide a timeline in which they would submit. The directors' orientation was moved on line and the processes for enrolling has been improved and was again revised this year to make it easier for programs to complete.

The Incentives Coordinator has developed policies and procedures to applying for scholarships, classroom enhancement grants, substitute and training reimbursement.

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"?

The highest tiers are defined as:

3 star programs must have an average ECERS-3 score of 3.75, average ITERS-R score of a 3.75, staff must have attended at 5 hours of research-based curriculum training and meeting 30-59 points (each standard is assigned a point value).

4 star programs must have an average ECERS-3 score of 4.5, average ITERS-R score of a 5, Infant/Toddler CLASS score (Emotional Support and Classroom Organization) of a 5, staff must have attended 10 hours of training in the selected research-based curriculum and meeting 60-85 points.

5 star programs must have an average ECERS-3 score of a 5, average ITERS-R score of 6, Infant/Toddler CLASS score (Emotional Support and Classroom Organization) 5.5 and Infant/Toddler CLASS score (Instructional Support and Engaged Support for Learning, fully-implementing selected research-based curriculum, and meeting 86-100 points.

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	660	1.4%	6,240	13.5%	12,060	26.1%	19,800	42.9%	26,940	58.3%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	240	1.9%	1,440	11.6%	2,496	20.1%	3,744	30.1%	5,376	43.2%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	352	3.8%	1,152	12.5%	1,696	18.4%	1,856	20.2%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	38	0.2%	286	1.3%	495	2.2%	999	4.5%	1,620	7.3%
Other 1	0	0%	1,260	14.6%	2,460	28.4%	4,380	50.6%	4,620	53.4%
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs									
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	46,177	660	1.4%	46,177	0	0%	46,177	13,568	29.4%						
<i>Specify:</i>	State-Funded Preschool Programs														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	12,447	240	1.9%	0	0	0%	12,447	0	0%						
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	9,209	0	0%	0	0	0%	9,209	0	0%						
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	22,186	38	0.2%	0	0	0%	22,186	0	0%						
Other 1	8,656	0	0%	0	0	0%	8,656	0	0%						
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four			
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 4															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

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

All early learning programs funded by Title 1 of ESEA are included within the State Preschool Program. Star levels 3,4, and 5 are included as "top tiers". As such, NJ has not identified many programs in "top tiers" as ratings have not widely been conducted.

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.

We anticipate the rating process to continue and increase in early 2017 and continuing throughout the life of the grant. New Jersey will continue to work toward meeting all grant targets by the end of the grant period.

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

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

I. Project Management

NIEER continues to work closely with the DOE on validating the quality rating that will be given to each program enrolled in Grow NJ Kids. There were minor problems faced in the first year of this study, including hesitation from centers and declining requests to assess children and observe classrooms, which have been largely improved in the second year of the study.

Throughout August and into September, a team of data collectors were hired to conduct child assessments. Several strong members of our team returned from last year and several new people were hired. Training on the battery of assessments and field protocol and etiquette took place in early September.

All centers from the first year of the study have been contacted this fall and child assessments are underway. The plan was to add several additional centers that were not included in the study in year 1, but this was contingent upon receiving a list of rated centers from DHS, which has not yet been received. Since it is late in the fall at this point, it is unlikely that we will be able to add these centers to our study.

II. Data Collection

Child Assessment tools. The assessment tools used were the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test- fourth edition (PPVT-4; Dunn & Dunn, 2007); Woodcock Johnson - third edition (WJ-III; Woodcock, R. & Johnson, M., 1989) Applied Problems Subtest; Dimensional Change Card Sort (DCCS; Zelazo, P. D., 2006); and Peg Tapping (Diamond & Taylor, 1996). Spanish versions were administered to children who were identified by their teachers as testing better in Spanish.

Child assessment data collection. Results from classroom observations, teacher surveys, and administrator surveys were presented in the previous Progress Report (July 2016). AY 2016-2017 is now underway and fall data collection is nearly complete. Assessments began in mid-September and have been completed for 1060 preschool children thus far. The end date for assessments is set for November 4th and the target sample is 1200 assessments. All 84 centers from last year were contacted about the study this year. A handful of centers either closed or chose to discontinue participation. These centers were replaced as much as possible, in order to maintain an adequate sample size. There were also several centers that combined classrooms or closed classrooms since last year. Additional classrooms from centers that were already part of our study were utilized to replace these classrooms. All children in the fall 2016 sample will be assessed again in spring 2017 in order to examine gains accrued over the course of the school year. Utilizing last year's sample as a guideline, we estimate roughly 20 percent attrition from fall to spring.

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

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

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

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

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

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

New Jersey's Birth to Three Early Learning Standards (BTT-ELS) are completed and have been disseminated across the state through various resources and organizations. Specifically, the state's infant/toddler quality initiative, First Steps, utilizes these standards with infant/toddler programs across the state. Although there hasn't been a formal evaluation, informal evaluations have shown program improvement in services and practices in the care of infants and toddlers. NJ's Core Knowledge and Competencies Framework is aligned with the BTT-ELS. Additionally, the state's QRIS, Grow NJ Kids, also includes the implementation of the BTT-ELS.

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.

***NEW JERSEY DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA C(2) IN THEIR
RTT-ELC APPLICATION***

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.

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

Central Intake: Central Intake provides families and providers with easy access for resource information and referrals to a wide range of local community services that promote child and family wellness, support health literacy between parents, health care providers, and early learning programs. The primary foci of central intake (CI) is to facilitate linkages from pregnancy to age five. However, all county sites will assist families and individuals with needed connections across the lifespan. Central Intake CI services are a collaboration between the New Jersey Departments of Health, and Children and Families, and the Department of Education. The primary focus of CI is to assist pregnant women, parents and families with young children in accessing the most appropriate services in an efficient manner. CI works closely with partners to eliminate duplication of efforts and services, and maximizes the collective impact and appropriate utilization of available and often scarce resources.

Developmental Screening: NJ has several sectors that require routine developmental screening using a standardized tool. Sectors include evidence-based Home Visiting, Head Start/Early Head Start, state-funded Preschools, and now, participating Grow NJ Kids child care centers. Others voluntarily screen infants and young children, e.g. some of our health and child care providers. The screens are completed but the information is not accessible to the child's pediatric primary care provider (medical home), or other sectors to avoid duplication. In March 2016 a study was completed for the NJ Department of Children and Families to determine feasibility/viability/cost of using a data system (e.g. the NJ Immunization Registry or alternate mechanism) to track developmental screenings. In the final report it was highlighted that integrating developmental screening into the New Jersey Immunization and Information System (NJIS) we (NJ) need to weigh the alignment of admirable goals with present realities and future promise; and suggest a timeline of activities for three to five years to reach the project vision. It was recognized that a lot of the work would entail garnering buy-in from all applicable systems, and giving ourselves the necessary time to do so.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

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

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.					
Baseline and Annual Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Number of Children with High Needs screened	75,399	75,399	79,169	83,128	87,284
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	7,104	7,104	7,459	7,832	8,224
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	73,648	73,648	77,330	81,197	85,257
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	72,239	72,239	75,851	79,644	83,626

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Number of Children with High Needs screened	75,399	86,880	95,480	100,254	
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	7,104	9,991	10,990	11,540	
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	73,648	85,142	93,642	98,324	
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care	72,239	82,536	90,736	95,273	

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

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

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

Routine screening for child development and linkage to pediatric primary care/medical home is an important focus of NJ's work with young children. Screening is also a priority for several major federal initiatives that are currently in place in the state. These include Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (ECCS), MIECHV, Help Me Grow (HMG), Project LAUNCH, and Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grants. NJ has a strong alignment of health service components with the Medicaid/NJ Family Care (CHIP) Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment requirements. In fact, NJ licensing standards for early learning programs require children to have a medical exam upon entry that includes immunizations, and lead testing; thus providing a basis for the Medicaid/NJ FamilyCare (CHIP) Early Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment (EPSDT) program requirements.

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

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

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

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

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

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.

The New Jersey Council for Young Children's Family and Community Engagement Committee has developed a resource rich document written specifically for parents/families. Unlike other documents that are positioned for parents meaning the document tells parents/families how to conduct themselves in certain environments, situations, etc. This document supports parents in supporting early learning and school readiness for their children.

The document was created by the committee which has parent representation and then presented to various parent groups for their reaction and feedback. This process resulted in a redesign of the document and significant changes to wording. The original document was one document encompassing birth to school-age children. However, parents only wanted to read information that pertained to the age of the child at the time. They did not want a thick document which had information they didn't currently need. They also felt the language was too formal and wanted a document that spoke to them in a familiar "voice." These changes have been made to the document. The Committee will be releasing 4 brochures (Before Baby, Infants/Toddlers, Preschoolers, and School-age) in the Spring 2017.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

(Section D(1) of Application)

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

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

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

New Jersey's Early Childhood Core Knowledge and Competencies Framework has been updated. It is on the New Jersey Council for Young Children's (NJCYC) webpage and has been copied for dissemination. The revision of this document resulted in the revision of NJ's Early Childhood Career Lattice which shows the progression of credentials and degrees. These documents live with the state's early childhood professional development organization, Professional Impact New Jersey (PINJ).

An unforeseen benefit to this process occurred when NJCYC's Early Care and Education Workforce Committee applied and successfully received a small grant from the National Governor's Association. This technical assistance and funding opportunity was provided to states to move forward state systems and services that support the early childhood workforce. New Jersey's focus is on creating an aligned and coordinated early care and education professional development system that is inclusive of all the early care and education systems in New Jersey.

The implementation process for this grant is to hold several consensus building sessions with various groups across the state. The data from these consensus groups will be analyzed and presented to an invited group of diverse early care and education professional development providers for recommendations and strategies. This entire process will be documented and a report of the findings will be formally presented to the NJCYC. The summit which will be the culmination of this process with the invited group of PD providers, will also be where the revised CKC will be unveiled and disseminated.

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.

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					
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider					

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					
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider					

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

***NEW JERSEY DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA D(2) IN THEIR
RTT-ELC APPLICATION
PAGES 38 of 87 THROUGH 40 of 87 HAVE BEEN DELETED***

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.

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.

As of June of 2016, a total of 854 teachers and 302 district level administrators across 91 districts, were trained in Teaching Strategies GOLD (GOLD), a rigorous and appropriate performance-based assessment instrument. During the first seven weeks of kindergarten, teachers collected evidence of children's performance across three of the nine Teaching Strategies Gold domains including social emotional, literacy, and mathematics, for the purpose of assigning a rating along a developmental continuum. Teachers who are in year two of implementation collected evidence on two additional Teaching Strategies Gold domains including, cognitive and language. Once teachers made ratings for each child at the end of the seven-week period, district-level teachers and administrators were able to view ratings and data of individual children, as well as aggregate ratings within each learning domain. The New Jersey DOE KEA GOLD® administrators have access where they can only generate aggregated outcome reports and cannot generate any child-level reports or access child-level data. One New Jersey DOE KEA GOLD® Manager has access to individual teacher accounts, with child-level data, only when an administrator or teacher submits a written/email request for assistance. Child data reports go to a New Jersey DOE Data Steward. In order to maintain the highest data security and quality standards, optimize data use and minimize misuse of information, both the New Jersey DOE KEA GOLD® Manager and the New Jersey Data Steward participate in yearly training offered through the Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC).

Technical Assistance Visits were made by Teaching Strategies within the first seven weeks, as well as subsequent visits at individual district requests. These visits ensured that participants would use the assessment tool with fidelity. As a strategy to support best practices in the kindergarten year, teachers participating in NJKEA also attended the Kindergarten Seminars, which is a five day regional series that began in October of 2016 and ends in May of 2017. This exciting and novel approach to support NJKEA implementation proved fruitful, whereas year three of implementation has revolved around best practices (e.g., curricular, whole-child learning, and appropriate environments) in order to support educators implementing this assessment system effectively and with fidelity. The seminars provide participants with an introduction to key features of New Jersey's Kindergarten Implementation Guidelines and the NJKEA initiative. The series includes sessions to support teachers in organizing classroom environments and schedules, implementing developmentally appropriate practices,

applying effective teaching strategies that support children's development and learning, incorporating the New Jersey Student Learning Standards and weaving in the GOLD assessment cycle throughout. Finally, all participants will use the instrument throughout the kindergarten year as a formative assessment tool.

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

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

As mentioned above, a total of eight hundred fifty-four teachers and three hundred two district level administrators across ninety-one districts, were trained in Teaching Strategies GOLD (GOLD), a rigorous and appropriate performance-based assessment instrument. Throughout the year, we have been soliciting participation for subsequent years. In early spring we will make NJKEA presentations regionally-based throughout the state, in order to finalize participation for the following year as well as communicate the timing for professional development offerings. We intend on continuing this process throughout the life of the grant.

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

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.

2016 has been an exciting year for Project 8: Data Systems, NJ-EASEL. Several Project Milestones and Deliverables have been met or are in progress including the following:

- Project Management: Monitored and updated the NJ-EASEL Work Breakdown Structure through ongoing planning sessions to determine the activities which can be completed prior to the end of the grant period (12/31/2017). Determined it would be necessary to request a no cost extension for 2018 in order to complete the initial Phase 1 implementation. In addition, it is likely scope will need to be reduced and/or more resources will be required.
- Data Governance: Data Governance Plan (DGP) was fully executed by the four NJ-EASEL participating agencies. The DGP has been used as a key reference document by both the NJ-EASEL Steering Committee and the NJ-EASEL Policy & Data Governance Council over the past year. Two more of the four Data Sharing Agreements (DSA) between the participating agencies were fully executed (Multi-Agency MOA for Data Sharing, and DOE and DOH MOA for Data Sharing) which leaves one DSA in progress.
- Requirements Definition & Analysis: Completed Source Data Analysis Sessions for the remaining 5 Group 1 source systems. Focused on Data Mapping activities (mapping source system data elements to the Crosswalk of NJ-EASEL Questions and Objectives, and to NJ-EASEL Child Master Data, Programs and Events) and initiated Mockup Reports.
- Design: Completed additional Logical and Physical Data Model Designs and associated ETL Data Mapping for 2 NJ DOE systems. Continued Logical and initiated Physical Data Model Designs and ETL Data Mapping for 1 NJ DHS system. Initiated Integrated Design activities for Child Master Data.
- Development & Testing: Completed development of 2 of the 3 ETL Processes components for 2 NJ DOE systems and 1 component for 1 DHS system. Initiated development of the 3rd ETL Process component for the 2 NJ DOE systems.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development.

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income¹ families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	38,437	6.4%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	76,780	12.7%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	76,481	14%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	191,678	32%

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.

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	33,728	5.6%
Are English learners ²	180,638	30%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	0	0%
Are migrant ³	361	0.06%
Are homeless ⁴	4,818	0.8%
Are in foster care	3,495	0.6%
Other 1 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

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

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

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

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

Data Table A(1)-2 Data Notes

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

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	0	0	43,891	43,891
<i>Specify:</i>	State Preschool Program			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2015 ASSA			
Early Head Start and Head Start¹	555	2,087	13,707	16,349
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Office of Head Start-Program Information Report (PIR) Enrollment Statistics Report-2015- State Level			
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619	729	10,684	11,943	23,356
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Child Count: 12/1/2014 (IDEA-Part C), 10/15/2014 IDEA (Part B)			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	135	13,773	13,908
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2013-14 CSPR (Section 2.1.2.3) Stand alone PK's are not eligible to be Title I served. Counts reported above for (Birth-Age 2) and (Ages 3-K)			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	2,231	12,587	12,216	27,304
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Child Care Viewer Report, October 2012.			
Other 1	0	0	8,129	8,129
<i>Specify:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2013-14 Projected Enrollment from individual state-approved budgets for each district.			
Other 2	2,777	2,373	278	5,428
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting (excludes pregnant women)			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 3				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 4				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 5				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

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

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

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

Data Table A(1)-3a Data Notes

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

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	22,572	84	1,580	14,113	105	300	5,136
<i>Specify:</i>	State Preschool Program						
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	8,189	62	415	5,833	19	1,029	4,052
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	3,245	11	674	1,116	19	443	5,301
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	14	933	1,613	46	228	5,674
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	4,624	17	392	3,376	31	73	2,267
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	10,292	13	264	9,534	58	179	4,601
Other 1	2,667	13	596	1,484	22	142	3,104
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs						
Other 2	2,196	15	46	1,459	69	154	879
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting (excludes pregnant women)						

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	3,009	0	97	3,105		97	6,212
<i>Describe:</i>	Special Child Health Services Case Management						
Other 4							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 5							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 6							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 7							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 8							
<i>Describe:</i>							

Data Table A(1)-3b Data Notes

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

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

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

Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start¹	\$39,800,000	\$40,300,000	\$40,400,000	\$40,400,000	
State-funded preschool	\$591,800,000	\$603,700,000	\$608,200,000	\$575,383,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	State Preschool Program				
State contributions to IDEA Part C	\$85,900,000	\$85,900,000	\$91,100,000	\$91,100,000	
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$56,900,000	\$59,800,000	\$59,800,000	\$598,000,000	
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$72,100,000	\$72,200,000	\$72,200,000	\$72,200,000	
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$54,200,000	\$76,000,000	\$76,000,000	\$76,000,000	
Other State contributions 1	\$41,900,000	\$44,000,000	\$45,800,000	\$45,800,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs				
Other State contributions 2	\$20,600,000	\$20,600,000	\$20,600,000	\$20,600,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Evidence-Based Home Visiting (HV)				
Other State contributions 3	\$650,000	\$650,000	\$650,000	\$650,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Strengthening Families / PF Framework				
Other State contributions 4	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Help Me Grow				
Other State contributions 5	0	\$140,000	\$140,000	\$140,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	ECCS Grant				
Other State contributions 6	0	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	
<i>Specify:</i>	Project Launch				

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					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 8					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Total State contributions:	\$1,010,000,000	\$1,050,000,000	\$1,060,320,000	\$1,060,320,000	

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

Data Table A(1)-4 Data Notes

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

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

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

Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program¹					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
State-funded preschool (<i>annual census count; e.g., October 1 count</i>)	43,671	43,891	43,891	43,177	
<i>Specify:</i>	State Funded Preschool				
Early Head Start and Head Start² (<i>funded enrollment</i>)	15,944	15,464	16,349	16,079	
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 (<i>annual December 1 count</i>)	12,031	22,840	23,356	23,356	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA (<i>total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report</i>)	10,780	10,780	13,908	10,849	
Programs receiving CCDF funds (<i>average monthly served</i>)	23,849	25,211	27,034	27,034	
Other 1	8,189	8,028	8,129	8,129	
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs				
Other 2	5,316	6,194	7,061	7,061	
<i>Describe:</i>	Special Child Health Services Birth Registry				
Other 3	4,878	5,428	7,104	7,104	
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting - statewide network of multiple models - pregnancy to age 3				
Other 4	1,799	2,818	3,832	3,832	
<i>Describe:</i>	Special Child Health Services Autism Registry				
Other 5	10,454	11,241	12,027	12,027	
<i>Describe:</i>	Special Child Health Services (Medically Fragile Children)				
Other 6					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 7					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 8					
<i>Describe:</i>					

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

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

Data Table A(1)-5 Data Notes

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

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

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

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

Data Table A(1)-6 Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

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	X	X
<i>Specify:</i>	State Preschool Program				
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹					
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C		X			X
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	X	X	X	X	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X	X			
Programs receiving CCDF funds					
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)	X		X		X
Tier 1					
Tier 2	X	X	X	X	X
Tier 3	X	X	X	X	X
Tier 4	X	X	X	X	X
Tier 5	X	X	X	X	X
State licensing requirements	X		X		X
Other 1	X	X	X	X	
<i>Describe:</i>	Other DOE-Funded Preschool Programs				
Other 2	X	X	X	X	
<i>Describe:</i>	Evidence-Based Home Visiting (HV)				
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

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

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

Data Table A(1)-7 Notes

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

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.

The momentum built during Year 2 of New Jersey's RTT-ELC grant continued to grow throughout Year 3, despite being under expended overall. Our primary areas of under spent funding were within our Grow NJ Kids-related projects (Projects 2 and 3) and our data systems initiatives (Project 8). The work in these projects has increased substantially, and we expect significant expenditures during the final year of the grant.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

Overall, we are not planning any significant changes to our RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year. Of course, as we move through the last year of the grant, we are carefully examining opportunities to fully expend grant funding in accordance with our overall scope of work, while also looking to build sustainability for projects within the grant. This may result in minor transfers throughout the year, but no substantive changes have been identified at this time.

Project Budget 1

Project Name: Grant Administration

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.

During the 2016 grant year, some grant staff moved on to other roles, adding to the overestimation in total salary and benefit costs. At the same time, expenditures for all other categories in Project 1 have hit, and sometimes exceeded, our originally anticipated levels. This is a sign that, overall, work on grant projects is progressing rapidly as we enter Year 4.

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.

Towards the end of Year 3 we requested, and received approval, to transfer \$470,000 from Project 1 to Project 8. The reason for this transfer was to facilitate enhancements to the New Jersey Department of Education's (NJDOE) Teacher Certification Information System (TCIS). The TCIS system is integral to both our NJ-EASEL data integration project, and also to our preschool through third grade work. As a result, transferred \$274,000 in unspent salary, fringe and indirect costs from Year 3 as well as \$196,000 in salary and indirect costs we do not anticipate expending in Year 4. The transferred funding will be spent out of the contractual line in Project 8.

Aside from this, minor transfers within Project 1 may be necessary during Year 4 to fully fund expenditures in the travel, supplies, and "other" lines.

Project Budget 2

Project Name: Aligned Training and Professional Development

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.

After dissolving our Training Academy MOU at the end of Year 2, DHS began coordinating Grow NJ Kids trainings. DHS is using Project 2 funding to hire Grow NJ Kids trainers and associated supplies, which are then offered out to Grow NJ Kids participants. While this arrangement is working out well, funding in Project 2 was under expended in Year 3 by approximately \$5 million. A portion of this discrepancy is due to invoices that we expect to receive and reconcile in Year 4.

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.

No substantive changes are anticipated to the budget for Project 2 in Year 4, however we do intend to transfer all unexpended funding to Year 4.

Project Budget 3

Project Name: Grow NJ Kids Rollout and Incentives Administration

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.

Our Year 3 budget for Project 3 was under expended by approximately \$283,054, a large improvement over prior years. We will carry forward dollars to Year 4 all under spent funding in these lines. Now that enrollment in Grow NJ Kids has hit a stride, we anticipate seeing expenditures for incentives continue to increase for Year 4.

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.

For Year 4, no substantive changes are anticipated in the budget for Project 3. All unspent funding will be transferred into corresponding lines for Year 4.

Project Budget 4

Project Name: Independent Ratings for Program Quality Improvement

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.

Total costs for Project 4 were over projected by \$654,983.37 in Year 3. While Grow NJ Kids participation has increased during Year 3, fewer programs than expected were ready for a formal rating. The Grow NJ Kids Coordinator and RTT-ELC Executive Director continue to work with Grow NJ Kids participants to assess current barriers to ratings, and to determine the best ways in which to incentivize programs to engage in the ratings process.

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.

While Grow NJ Kids ratings were slower than anticipated in Years 2 and 3, we are anticipating that they will increase during the final year of the grant. As such, we will transfer all unspent Year 3 funding to Year 4 and no other substantive changes are anticipated.

Project Budget 5

Project Name: Validating the Grow NJ Kids Tiered QRIS

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.

Year 3 costs for Project 5 were overestimated by \$220,970.78. This discrepancy is due to the fact that the validation study for Grow NJ Kids was delayed as a result of the smaller than anticipated number of programs prepared to receive a formal rating. The validation study is dependent upon having a statistically significant number of programs rated in Grow NJ Kids. However, this work is now underway, and we anticipate expenditures to continue to increase throughout Year 4.

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.

For Year 4, no substantive changes are anticipated in the budget for Project 5. All unspent funding will be transferred into corresponding lines for Year 4.

Project Budget 6

Project Name: Family Engagement and Health Promotion

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.

Approximately \$664,599 in Year 3 grant funding went unexpended for Project 6. Expenditures related to our County Councils for Young Children and Central In-take Hubs made significant progress throughout the year, and we anticipate that these expenditures will continue to increase. We are very confident that expenditures for this work will remain on track throughout the remainder of the grant period.

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.

All unspent Year 3 funding will be carried over to Year 4 to continue the progress of this work. An adjustment was made to the Year 4 contractual line to account for a previously approved transfer. No additional substantive changes are anticipated for this project.

Project Budget 7

Project Name: Public Outreach and Awareness

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.

Total Year 3 expenditures for Project 7 were over projected by \$858,122.94. A small portion of this (\$6,514) is attributed to under spent Indirect Costs, though we expect some of these charges will be expensed during the first part of Year 4. The larger portion of unspent funding (\$851,608.94) is from the Contractual line, where expenses for advertizing, the development of a Grow NJ Kids website and newsletter, and work to develop business partnerships were lower than anticipated. Work in each of these areas is progressing, however, and we expect to see greater expenditures during Year 4.

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.

All unspent Year 3 funding will be carried over to Year 4 to continue the progress of this work. We do not anticipate any substantive changes to the budget for this project in the upcoming year.

Project Budget 8

Project Name: Data Systems

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.

In Year 3, Project 8 was under expended by \$3,386,682.34. While this is a large variance, a great deal of work was accomplished during the 3rd year of the grant. A large portion of this discrepancy is due to a delay in the development of a contract/MOA with our state Office of Information Technology (OIT) to develop our NJ-EASEL data system. This lack of payment is not due to a lack of work on this project, however. OIT is working diligently to develop the NJ-EASEL system, and significant progress has been made, particularly over the last 24 months. OIT does not typically use a contract/MOA as a vehicle for receiving payments and, as a result, the contract/MOA template is undergoing extensive review and has not yet been executed. Once the document is signed, OIT will expense the NJ DOE for all of the work that has been done to this point in the grant period. We intend to carry forward the unexpended funding from Year 3 to Year 4 in anticipation of this.

Other discrepancies in the Year 3 budget can be attributed to a delay in the RFP process for both our Workforce Registry and state Licensing systems. However, the RFP was recently awarded and we anticipate expenditures for these systems to come on line soon.

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.

All unspent Year 3 funding will be carried over to Year 4 to continue the progress of this work. We do not anticipate any other substantive changes to the budget for this project in the upcoming year.

Project Budget 9

Project Name: Preschool-Third Grade Initiatives

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 Year 3 budget for Project 9 was under spent by a total of \$1,480,400.52. A small portion of this funding is associated with our grants to several districts to explore technology-based curricula. The grants were awarded during Year 2, but no funding was charged until the start of Year 3. We expect the grantees to expend any remaining allowable expenditures during Year 4.

The vast majority of remaining under expended funding can be attributed to MOUs with state universities to develop:

- Supporting materials and trainings for our First through Third Grade Guidelines;
- A study of classroom quality in Kindergarten through Third Grade classrooms;
- An update to NJ's existing Preschool Guidelines; and
- A self-assessment tool for Kindergarten through Grade Three programs

Work on each of these initiatives is well under way, however the state is awaiting invoices for this work.

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.

All unspent Year 3 funding will be carried over to Year 4 to continue the progress of this work. We do not anticipate any other substantive changes to the budget for this project in the upcoming year.

Project Budget 10

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.

No grant funding was projected during Year 3 in Project 10. Our estimate of in-kind funding during Year 3 was overestimated by about \$127,654.50. A great deal of effort went into our Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) initiative during Year 3 of the grant. Trainings were conducted continuously throughout the state to support classroom teachers in the use of the KEA, and to strengthen Kindergarten practices.

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.

We are not anticipating any substantive changes to our Year 4 budget for Project 10.

Project Budget 11

Project Name: Standards

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.

Our Year 3 budget for Project 11 was under spent by \$93,317. As originally budgeted, all work associated with this project involved the editing, formatting, printing and distribution of various Guidance and Standards documents. However, we've found that this work is already incorporated into our agreements with state universities to develop these materials. As a result we will likely look to transfer the remaining funding from this project into other areas.

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.

At this time, we are proposing to carry all unspent Year 3 funding into Year 4. However, we plan to reevaluate the remaining funding budgeted within this project and consider possible budget transfers to other areas of need within our overall grant.

Project Budget 12

Project Name: _____

***NEW JERSEY'S RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 11 PROJECTS. -
PAGES 70-87 HAVE BEEN DELETED -***

RTT-ELC Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$239,425.53	\$419,404.29	\$416,622.66	\$0.00	\$1,075,452.48
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,777.15	\$187,237.68	\$179,430.08	\$0.00	\$393,444.91
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$2,030.80	\$5,977.60	\$0.00	\$8,008.40
4. Equipment	\$4,333.73	\$17,997.24	\$13,761.29	\$0.00	\$36,092.26
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$1,053.82	\$7,029.37	\$0.00	\$8,083.19
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$3,059,782.79	\$2,316,103.68	\$0.00	\$5,375,886.47
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$17,893.94	\$290,580.35	\$0.00	\$308,474.29
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$270,536.41	\$3,705,400.56	\$3,229,505.03	\$0.00	\$7,205,442.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$4,514.05	\$10,973.14	\$11,381.07	\$0.00	\$26,868.26
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$149,300.00	\$2,789,647.69	\$4,884,198.63	\$0.00	\$7,823,146.32
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$50,812.07	\$37,866.19	\$34,102.13	\$0.00	\$122,780.39
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$475,162.53	\$6,543,887.58	\$8,159,186.86	\$0.00	\$15,178,236.97
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$19,671,594.87	\$20,139,472.30	\$20,041,734.50	\$0.00	\$59,852,801.67
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$20,146,757.40	\$26,683,359.88	\$28,200,921.36	\$0.00	\$75,031,038.64

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 Administration

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$239,425.53	\$371,867.34	\$285,058.32	\$0.00	\$896,351.19
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,777.15	\$173,145.65	\$179,430.08	\$0.00	\$379,352.88
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$2,030.80	\$5,032.53	\$0.00	\$7,063.33
4. Equipment	\$4,333.73	\$7,370.68	\$3,265.93	\$0.00	\$14,970.34
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$1,053.82	\$6,529.27	\$0.00	\$7,583.09
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	\$17,893.94	\$38,704.32	\$0.00	\$56,598.26
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$270,536.41	\$573,362.23	\$518,020.45	\$0.00	\$1,361,919.09
10. Indirect Costs*	\$4,514.05	\$10,973.14	\$11,381.07	\$0.00	\$26,868.26
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$50,812.07	\$37,866.19	\$34,102.13	\$0.00	\$122,780.39
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$325,862.53	\$622,201.56	\$563,503.65	\$0.00	\$1,511,567.74
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$86,120.00	\$86,120.00	\$86,120.00	\$0.00	\$258,360.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$411,982.53	\$708,321.56	\$649,623.65	\$0.00	\$1,769,927.74

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 - Aligned Training and Professional Development

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500.10	\$0.00	\$500.10
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$1,944,888.82	\$495,207.02	\$0.00	\$2,440,095.84
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$1,944,888.82	\$495,707.12	\$0.00	\$2,440,595.94
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	\$114,903.86	\$0.00	\$114,903.86
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$1,944,888.82	\$610,610.98	\$0.00	\$2,555,499.80
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$15,037,660.00	\$15,291,574.00	\$15,411,941.00	\$0.00	\$45,741,175.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$15,037,660.00	\$17,236,462.82	\$16,022,551.98	\$0.00	\$48,296,674.80

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 - Grow NJ Kids Rollout and Incentives Administration

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$47,536.95	\$131,564.34	\$0.00	\$179,101.29
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$14,092.03	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,092.03
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$945.07	\$0.00	\$945.07
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$4,433.79	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,433.79
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$66,062.77	\$132,509.41	\$0.00	\$198,572.18
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	\$494,808.00	\$2,365,674.46	\$0.00	\$2,860,482.46
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$560,870.77	\$2,498,183.87	\$0.00	\$3,059,054.64
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,560,870.77	\$3,498,183.87	\$0.00	\$6,059,054.64

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 - Independent Ratings for Program Quality Improvement through Grow NJ Kids

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$128,325.29	\$245,016.63	\$0.00	\$373,341.92
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$128,325.29	\$245,016.63	\$0.00	\$373,341.92
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$128,325.29	\$245,016.63	\$0.00	\$373,341.92
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$128,325.29	\$245,016.63	\$0.00	\$373,341.92

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 - Validating the Grow NJ Kids Tiered QRIS

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$3,992.45	\$415,979.22	\$0.00	\$419,971.67
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$3,992.45	\$415,979.22	\$0.00	\$419,971.67
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$3,992.45	\$415,979.22	\$0.00	\$419,971.67
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$3,992.45	\$415,979.22	\$0.00	\$419,971.67

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 - Family Engagement and Health Connections

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$36,440.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,440.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$36,440.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$36,440.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$149,300.00	\$2,294,839.69	\$2,194,582.31	\$0.00	\$4,638,722.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$149,300.00	\$2,331,279.69	\$2,194,582.31	\$0.00	\$4,675,162.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$149,300.00	\$2,331,279.69	\$2,194,582.31	\$0.00	\$4,675,162.00

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 - Public Outreach and Awareness

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$356,614.05	\$196,620.01	\$0.00	\$553,234.06
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$356,614.05	\$196,620.01	\$0.00	\$553,234.06
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$356,614.05	\$196,620.01	\$0.00	\$553,234.06
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$2,124,937.00	\$2,124,937.00	\$2,124,937.00	\$0.00	\$6,374,811.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$2,124,937.00	\$2,481,551.05	\$2,321,557.01	\$0.00	\$6,928,045.06

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 - Data Systems

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	\$6,192.77	\$10,495.36	\$0.00	\$16,688.13
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$493,840.00	\$911,753.50	\$0.00	\$1,405,593.50
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$250,877.03	\$0.00	\$250,877.03
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$500,032.77	\$1,173,125.89	\$0.00	\$1,673,158.66
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$500,032.77	\$1,173,125.89	\$0.00	\$1,673,158.66
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,500,032.77	\$2,173,125.89	\$0.00	\$4,673,158.66

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 - Preschool-3rd Grade Initiative

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$94,683.18	\$33,527.30	\$0.00	\$128,210.48
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$94,683.18	\$33,527.30	\$0.00	\$128,210.48
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	\$209,038.00	\$0.00	\$209,038.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$94,683.18	\$242,565.30	\$0.00	\$337,248.48
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$263,062.00	\$274,277.55	\$291,082.00	\$0.00	\$828,421.55
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$263,062.00	\$368,960.73	\$533,647.30	\$0.00	\$1,165,670.03

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 - Kindergarten Entry Assessment

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$159,815.87	\$362,563.75	\$127,654.50	\$0.00	\$650,034.12
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$159,815.87	\$362,563.75	\$127,654.50	\$0.00	\$650,034.12

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 - Standards

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$999.00	\$18,000.00	\$0.00	\$18,999.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$999.00	\$0.00	\$999.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$999.00	\$18,999.00	\$0.00	\$19,998.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$999.00	\$18,999.00	\$0.00	\$19,998.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$999.00	\$18,999.00	\$0.00	\$19,998.00

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.