

2013 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Ohio





Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge

Annual Performance Report

Ohio

2013

CFDA Number: 84.412
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0713
Expiration Date: December 31, 2016

Table of Contents

APR Cover Sheet	1
Certification	2
Executive Summary	3
Successful State Systems	6
Governance Structure	6
Stakeholder Involvement	7
Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders.....	10
Participating State Agencies	11
High-Quality, Accountable Programs	12
Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).....	12
Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)	15
Performance Measure (B)(2)(c).....	16
Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).....	19
Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).....	21
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1)	24
Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)	25
Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).....	28
Focused Investment Areas: Sections (C), (D), and (E)	29
Promoting Early Learning Outcomes	30
Early Learning Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)	30
Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application)	31
Early Childhood Education Workforce	34
Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials (Section D(1) of Application)	34
Measuring Outcomes and Progress	35
Understanding the Status of Children’s Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)	35
Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)	37
Data Tables	41
Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age.....	41
Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs	42
Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age	43
Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity.....	44
Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.....	46
Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	47

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards	48
Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State	49
Budget and Expenditure Tables	50
Budget Summary Table	50
Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Management.....	52
Budget Table: Project 2 – Validation and Consumer Education.....	54
Budget Table: Project 3 – Increase Access to High Quality Programs.....	56
Budget Table: Project 4 – Maryland Collaboration	58
Budget Table: Project 5 – Professional Development and Formative Instruction Modules	60
Budget Table: Project 6 – Professional Development Coordination	62
Budget Table: Project 7 – Measures of Quality	64
Budget Table: Project 8 – Progressions of Credentials.....	66
Budget Table: Project 9 – Alignment with Ohio's Core Knowledge Competencies (CKC).....	68
Budget Table: Project 10 – Child Link System	70
Budget Table: Project 11 – Re-engineering Step Up To Quality and Licensing Database	72
Budget Table: Project 12 – Child Assessment System.....	74
Budget Table: Project 13 – Sustain in the Early Grades	76

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



APR Cover Sheet

General Information

1. **PR/Award #:** S412A120028
2. **Grantee Name:** Office of the Governor, State of Ohio
3. **Grantee Address:** 77 South High Street, Columbus, OH, 43215
4. **Project Director Name:** Stephanie Siddens

Title: Director, Office of Early Learning and School Readiness

Phone #: (614) 995-3449 **Fax #:** (614) 728-2338

Email Address: Stephanie.Siddens@education.ohio.gov

Reporting Period Information

5. **Reporting Period:** 1/1/2013 to 12/31/2013

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): 07/01/2013 to 06/31/2014

Approving Federal agency: ED HHS Other



Certification

The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:

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

Yes No

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

Yes No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

Yes No

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

Signed by Authorized Representative

Name: Angel Rhodes

Title: Early Education and Development Officer

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.

The State of Ohio's Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grant application laid out Governor John R. Kasich's aggressive reform agenda, which closes the kindergarten readiness gap between children with high needs and their peers by increasing access to high-quality services, improving the quality of early childhood experiences, and measuring and reporting progress toward desired results for Ohio's young children in need. Ohio's Year 2 report provides information on Ohio's major accomplishments. The most significant accomplishment continues to be the increase in high needs children that have access to a highly rated early learning and development programs. During Year 2, Ohio experienced a 19% increase in its number of programs participating in Step Up To Quality, with a 15 percent increase of highly rated programs. Over 1,100 more children that are participating in the state's Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC) program are utilizing a highly rated program. In addition, 874 more programs are willing to serve children in the PFCC program than when Ohio was awarded the RTT-ELC, increasing access for families. Finally, a new set of public preschool programs, as well as child care programs, have registered for participation in Ohio's newly expanded Step Up To Quality.

Focused, Accountable Leadership

Ohio has organized a focused and accountable RTT-ELC cross-agency project management leadership team comprised of senior early childhood leaders from the Ohio Departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Developmental Disabilities and the Governor's office. On January 2, 2013, the Governor named Angel Rhodes, Ph.D., as the RTT-ELC Early Education and Development Officer. This key leadership position is housed within the Governor's Office and is charged with aligning early learning and development priorities and goals with those across the educational continuum. Throughout Year 2, the RTT-ELC team actively engaged key stakeholders in providing input in key revisions and new development work related to child standards, program standards and the child assessment system. In addition, the RTT-ELC leadership team created project teams to work on specific goals outlined in the RTT-ELC plan.

Common Statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS)

The new SUTQ was available for all large family child care homes and center-based early learning and development programs, including school district-operated and community-based preschools, child care and Head Start programs. During Year 2 all efforts moved from re-designing the TQRIS to developing policies and procedures for the implementation of the new system. Ohio revised its TQRIS, called Step Up To Quality (SUTQ) by expanding the current three tier system to a five tier system and revising the domains and standards within the TQRIS which are aligned with Ohio's Early Learning Standards. Programs will be phased into the SUTQ rating system based on a schedule set by ODE and ODJFS and approved by the Ohio General Assembly. As of December 2013, over 50 ODJFS licensed and 120 ODE licensed programs have registered to participate in the revised system. In the fall, the draft standards for small family child care homes (Type B Home providers) were released and posted for public comment. Type B Home providers will be eligible to apply for a star-rating in July 2014.

Supporting the Use of Ohio's Early Learning and Development Standards

In 2012, Ohio crafted comprehensive Early Learning and Development Standards for children ages birth to kindergarten entry. For Year 2 of Ohio's Early Learning Challenge Grant, Ohio focused on supporting early

childhood professionals' use of Ohio's comprehensive early learning and development standards. Three key support mechanisms that Ohio implemented included: 1) implementation guides 2) curriculum alignment tool, and 3) professional development and technical assistance. In June 2013, Ohio began to roll out professional development on the revised standards which are available at three different levels to address the graduated competency and knowledge levels of the early childhood field. Professional development staff from all four of the regional professional development and technical assistance networks (Child Care Resource & Referral, State Support Teams, Early Childhood Mental Health Consultants and Health Promotion Consultants) deployed training statewide on the domain(s) that align to their expertise and credentials. These trainings are also being designed to be available on-line through the state's iLearn Ohio network thus providing consistent high quality training to a larger number of professionals across the state. In 2013, over 10,000 professionals have participated in the new professional development.

Comprehensive Assessment System and Kindergarten Readiness Assessment

A comprehensive assessment system includes not only assessments but extensive professional development supports. Ohio partnered with the state of Maryland to design a new Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System that includes a formative assessment for children ages 36-72 months, a kindergarten readiness assessment, a technology framework and professional development supports. In 2013, Ohio completed three phases of piloting for the new kindergarten readiness assessment with kindergarten students and teachers. Phase one, the cognitive interviews, were conducted with teachers and students in January 2013 which included interviews and collection of feedback on item prototypes. Phase two, the pilot, was completed in April 2013 during which kindergarten teachers administered items to students. Phase three, a large scale field test, was completed in November and December 2013. Nearly 3,500 Ohio students and 127 teachers participated in the phase three field test, which included all six domains. The assessment vendor used the results of the pilots to make data-driven changes to item types, content, wording, graphics, and administration procedures. In 2014, field test data will be used to finalize the set of items for statewide administration and develop scoring and reporting components for the statewide administration scheduled for fall 2014. Ohio is developing new professional development modules that will further support professionals' use of assessments to inform instruction. The new professional development will directly support the new assessments on the selection and use of other assessments at the classroom level.

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and Progression of Credentials

Ohio revised the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, called Ohio's Core Knowledge and Competencies (CKC), to meet the newly revamped TQRIS model and our new Early Learning and Development Standards. Together with the state, regional and local experts on the Ohio Professional Development Network, work also began on revising and updating the current CKC Instructor Guide. In addition, at the direction of RTT-ELC leadership team external consultants drafted the bridging document (for CKC and K-12 educator standards) and drafted a report on the assessment of the progression and availability of degrees and credentials. Ohio will hold several formal meetings with two- and four-year higher education institutions to ensure effective and seamless communication about and implementation of the CKC documents.

Early Learning Data Systems

Ohio has made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System as well as enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System. Ohio Department of Job and Family Services established the technology infrastructure to assign the unique identification number for children in publicly funded child care to provide seamless

connections across the different data systems while protecting personal privacy. The number is also used for children from preschool through post-secondary. In addition, Ohio has drafted a cross-agency memorandum of understanding to share data at the state level for the purpose of addressing key policy and research needs for the state. Finally, Ohio released its new data system for SUTQ that collects program quality and licensing data across ODJFS and ODE. In addition, Ohio and Maryland finalized business requirements for and field tested the new Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System that will collect child assessment and demographic information and link to Ohio's State Longitudinal Data System. The new early learning data systems will allow Ohio to link program quality and child outcome information. Having this critical information will allow Ohio decision-makers and legislators to make decisions about investments that are based on demonstrated child outcomes and program quality while maintaining the anonymity of each child.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

Challenges and lessons learned include that we underestimated the time, capacity, and effort needed for state agencies to: 1) coordinate the regional professional development networks and help them break down long standing silos; 2) create a communications strategy to help the early childhood community shift from existing assessments they are comfortable with to using and valuing a new expanded assessment that uses different approaches and content; and 3) establish new common business processes and policies for conducting licensing and quality rating visits that translate into a common data system. As Ohio begins implementation of Year 3 efforts, major areas of focus and thinking on the part of the participating state agencies will include how best to coordinate seamless regional professional development and technical assistance supports for early childhood programs, effective and frequent communications on the roll-out of the training and implementation of the new Kindergarten Readiness Assessment in fall, and coordinated implementation and use of Ohio's new data system for Step Up To Quality. Ohio will continue to seek out technical assistance experts and private sector organizations to assist Ohio in designing reform strategies that will truly benefit Ohio's children. Ohio's ultimate goal is to be able to link decision-making about investments to demonstrated positive outcomes for children and programs.

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).

RTT-ELC Cross-Agency Leadership

The State of Ohio's RTT-ELC Grant Leadership and Project Management team meets monthly and includes each Participating State Agency (PSA). Senior early childhood leaders from Ohio Departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Developmental Disabilities, and the Governor's Office attend the monthly team meetings. The purpose of the RTT-ELC monthly leadership meetings is to discuss governance, fiscal monitoring, communications, and RTT-ELC project updates. The RTT-ELC grant fiscal officer from the Ohio Department of Education attends each meeting as well. The leadership team spends time discussing and planning the work of the four project teams related to: 1) assessment and standards; 2) professional development; 3) quality, access and financing; and 4) family support and engagement. During the monthly meetings, PSA's provide input and feedback on grant activities, which are documented in monthly meeting minutes to maintain a record of recommendations and decisions. ODE serves as the lead fiscal agency providing programmatic and fiscal monitoring and accountability to the RTT-ELC grant. Core senior leadership members from ODE and ODJFS participate in monthly grant calls with the project officers from the U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services. ODE and ODJFS team members then provide updates from the federal call to the rest of the PSAs during their monthly leadership meetings.

Governor's Office Leadership

Senior staff from Governor Kasich's office has been actively engaged in the planning, implementation and decision making related to the RTT-ELC reform agenda. With the appointment of the Early Education and Development Officer in January 2013, Dr. Angel Rhodes provides direction, coordination and leadership to the Participating State Agencies regarding early learning and development priorities and goals with those across the educational continuum. This position has lead responsibility for coordination of policy and administration related to early childhood across the multiple state agencies that fund or administer early childhood programs. Senior staff in the Governor's Office meet with Dr. Rhodes on a regular basis to ensure consistent coordination and communication about the grant. Dr. Rhodes has organized and convened the four project teams of external stakeholders and state agencies. The project teams have established their membership, goals, and work plans for the year.

Early Childhood Advisory Council

The senior early childhood leaders from Ohio Departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Head Start Collaboration Office are appointed to and attend the monthly Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) meetings (state advisory council) to provide regular updates on the RTT-ELC grant efforts. ECAC members are asked to provide input on all major initiatives. The ECAC funds which ended in August, 2013, supported the design and rollout of the professional development on the Early Learning and

Development Standards, technology for the assessment system, an early care and education needs assessment and a workforce study. In addition to providing advice and support on the Early Learning Challenge Grant activities, the ECAC serves as an advisory body for the Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program and the State Early Childhood Coordinated Systems grant (SECCS).

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.

Ohio realizes the importance of ensuring that stakeholders, including representatives from participating programs, early childhood educators and families are involved in the implementation of Ohio's Early Learning Challenge Grant. Throughout the implementation of major activities in the grant, Ohio has consistently engaged stakeholders by organizing focus groups, presenting key ideas and models at stakeholder meetings, providing opportunities for widespread public comment and utilizing Ohio's earlychildhoodohio.org website devoted to early childhood topics specific to Ohio.

Input on Supports and Professional Development for Implementation of Ohio Early Learning and Development Standards

For Year 2 of Ohio's Early Learning Challenge Grant, Ohio has shifted its focus to supporting early childhood professionals' use of Ohio's comprehensive early learning and development standards. Three key support mechanisms have been the focus in Year 2 for Ohio's development and implementation efforts: 1) implementation guides 2) curriculum alignment tool, and 3) professional development and technical assistance. Ohio ensured that stakeholders were involved in providing input and feedback into the development of these three support mechanisms described below.

- **Implementation Guides:** The Standards Implementation Guides in each domain provide strategies for teachers to address and implement the Early Learning and Development Standards in developmentally appropriate ways within the classroom. The development of the Implementation Guides included convening focus groups comprised of teachers, assistant teachers, administrators, specialists, parents, and community stakeholders, from a variety of early childhood settings including district-operated preschool and preschool special education programs, community child care, Head Start and family child care serving children birth to kindergarten entry. The data from the focus groups were compiled into the Implementation Guides. Drafts were posted for public comment, reviewed by the Early Learning Challenge Grant cross-agency Professional Development Coordination Team which includes representatives of the Ohio Departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Developmental Disabilities and the Governor's Office. Additionally the draft documents were reviewed for cultural and linguistic sensitivity by state experts and the Early Learning Challenge Grant English Language Learners Advisory Committee.
- **Curriculum Standards, Assessment Alignment Tool:** The Curriculum Alignment Tool was developed to support the alignment between the early learning and development standards, a program's assessment and a program's curriculum. The Curriculum Alignment Tool was available for public comment by early childhood professionals representing all sectors and reviewed by the Early Learning Challenge Grant cross-agency Professional Development Coordination Team.

- **Professional Development and Technical Assistance:** In Year 2 of the grant, Ohio has developed and begun implementation of a number of professional development modules to support the use of the Early Learning and Development Standards. Ohio has developed three levels of professional development modules that range from overviews to in-depth focus on the standards across age bands. The development of the modules included input from a variety of experts in each content or developmental area. These experts included a developmental psychologist, a mathematics professor specializing in early childhood content, a social studies expert and an infant toddler specialist. After each module was developed, the modules were then reviewed and approved by members of each Participating State Agency.

Input on Ohio's Program Standards and Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System

Ohio's stakeholders were involved in revising and expanding the program standards in Ohio's tiered quality rating and improvement system, Step Up To Quality (SUTQ), in year one of the grant. A leadership team comprised of state agency representatives from the Ohio Departments of Education, including the Head Start Collaboration director, Job and Family Services and regional professional development representatives from the State Support Teams and the Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Association worked with a national expert in the field of program standards to determine the process for revising and expanding SUTQ for programs and large family child care homes (Type A homes). In January 2014, Ohio shifted from certifying to licensing small family child care homes (Type B homes) that are serving publicly funded families. Beginning in July 2014, Type B homes will also be eligible to participate in SUTQ. Ohio began working on completing revisions to the currently existing Type A home program standards, to include Type B homes into a single set of family child care program standards. The draft family child care standards were developed and presented to a variety of stakeholders, including a focus group made up of Type A and Type B family child care providers, union representatives, and county Department of Job and Family Services staff to obtain feedback on the structure and content of the revised program standards. The standards also were presented to the Child Care Advisory Council and the Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies. Once input was gathered from specific stakeholders, the program standards were posted for public comment at earlychildhoodohio.org and a wide variety of stakeholders were targeted to obtain feedback. Almost 100 stakeholders responded to the public comment survey. The next step in the process will be to post the family child care program standards for public comment during the official rule clearance process will begin in March 2014.

Input on Licensing Changes

In January 2014, small family child care homes, which were certified by 88 county departments of Job and Family Services (CDJFS), became licensed by ODJFS. There are currently two sets of licensing rules which regulate the two types of family child care in Ohio; large family homes and small family homes. A single set of rules for licensure that will be inclusive of both types of care is currently being created, with an implementation date of January 2015. Stakeholders have been involved in the process of reviewing the two existing sets of rules to identify areas where they align and are different. A workgroup, including both large and small family child care providers, CDJFS staff and union representatives were involved in completing the review and making final recommendations on the content of the new family child care rule requirements. These recommendations were shared with the Child Care Advisory Council policy workgroup for additional input and suggestions.

Ohio Department of Education rules for preschool licensing are under review and are being updated and revised based on a five year rule review requirement to ensure alignment with ODJFS. As of December 2013, stakeholder input was sought on three occasions including two opportunities for input via surveys and one face-

to-face meeting with a representative group of programs affected by the rules including public districts and chartered non-public schools.

Input on the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System

Ohio continues to seek stakeholder input regarding the design and implementation of the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System (EC-CAS). Ohio is collaborating with the state of Maryland to design and implement a formative assessment for children ages 36 through 72 months as well as a Kindergarten Readiness Assessment. The national Technical Advisory Committee (TAC, established in 2012) comprised of developmental psychologists, early childhood content area experts, experts on young English Language Learners and students with disabilities, and psychometricians, met in person with the leadership team in February 2013 and July 2013. This committee also provided written feedback on draft elements of assessment twice during the year (March and September/October). The Ohio EC-CAS Advisory Committee, which includes local early childhood program administrators from district preschools, child care, family child care, and Head Start, as well as elementary building administrators, higher education faculty, private foundations and business sector representatives met twice in person to review and provide input on the assessment development. Ohio assembled six ad hoc committees (in February, April, and September 2013) to review Kindergarten Readiness Assessment items at various stages in the item development process. Ad hoc committee members represented primarily early childhood educators and practitioners from all sectors. In addition, Ohio completed three phases of piloting for the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment in 2013: cognitive interviews (January), a pilot (April), and a field test (November/December). Each phase involved kindergarten teachers and students from across the state interacting with assessment items and providing feedback. Also during the field test, teachers received professional development and utilized an online reporting system for accessing assessment items and inputting scores. Teachers who participated in the field test were invited to complete a series of surveys about their experiences with all components of the field test. Further, teachers who administered the field test assessment to children with disabilities and/or English language learners were invited to participate in focus groups.

Input from Other Stakeholder Groups

Representatives from Ohio's state agencies regularly present information on the EC-CAS design, supports for child standards, and supports for implementation of programs standards to a variety of stakeholders including the Child Care Advisory Council, the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, the Early Childhood Advisory Council, State Support Teams, Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, and the English Language Learner Advisory Group.

The **State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC)** is composed of 50 percent of parents and 50 percent state agency or professional staff; its membership is an important sounding board and feedback mechanism about issues related to the education of children with disabilities. The group has been the recipient of information related to the Ohio Early Learning Challenge Grant particularly as it relates to child outcomes. SAPEC is provided on-going updates and is asked for input on a number of issues related to the Early Learning Challenge Grant. These have focused on information regarding the grant target groups, which include children with disabilities, the nature of the work promoted through the Early Learning Challenge Grant, which includes assessment and early learning and development standards and descriptions of the ways in which grant goals and objectives include and overlap with those set forth in Federal Indicators for special education performance and compliance.

Ohio's English Language Learner Advisory Group was formed to assist early childhood professionals in supporting young English Language Learners (ELL) and to ensure the challenges faced by students and families for whom English is not their native language, are given due consideration as part of the effort to close the achievement gap for children with high needs. Members of this committee include parents of ELL children, educators from institutions of higher learning that specialize in ELL student populations, and professionals that work with parents of young ELL learners. The ELL Advisory Group met three times during 2013. The ELL Advisory Group provided recommendations for strategies and resources to implement the Early Learning and Development Standards, engaged a national expert regarding the development of Early Learning and Development Standards for English Language Learners, and advised on providing additional supports for teachers to utilize with English Language Learners. The group is working to identify language-dependent skills assessed in the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, provide guidance regarding the supports that may be unique to an assessment item type, develop appropriate supports on an item -by-item basis and provide feedback on the existing guidance document.

Ohio's Early Childhood Advisory Council and Project Teams hear monthly updates and provide input on implementation of Ohio's early learning and development standards, professional development, Step Up To Quality, and the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System. In addition, four project teams were formed and provided input on specific issues related to quality and financing, professional development, communications with families, and standards and assessments.

Ohio regularly updates and uses its **website** (earlychildhoodohio.org) to target early childhood program administrators and teachers to provide important updates and information regarding the RTT-ELC grant activities, as well as early childhood system development efforts. This site is a partnership between the Participating State Agencies (PSAs) and contains information about all of the existing early childhood programs. Through the site, stakeholders can request to receive on-going updates and emails from the state team. Currently more than 3,100 Ohio professionals have signed up. As we continue to develop the website, Ohio is focusing its efforts to a new area that will work to engage families by providing helpful resources, educational materials and tools that will be implemented in 2014.

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.

During Year 2 of the grant, Ohio passed its 2014 and 2015 biennial budget. Within the budget there were a number of reforms and changes that impacted the early learning and development area:

- **Kindergarten Readiness Assessment Window Expanded in Statute:**

With the implementation of the comprehensive Kindergarten Readiness Assessment scheduled for Fall 2014, the assessment window, which was already specified in statute was modified in House Bill 59 to include a longer assessment window and to allow for the language and literacy portion of the assessment to be used to meet the Ohio third grade reading guarantee requirements. The original assessment window which ended October 1 each year was modified to be administered from beginning of the school year to November 1. With a more comprehensive assessment, Ohio wanted to ensure teachers had sufficient time to assess all kindergarten

children. In addition, Ohio is implementing the third grade reading guarantee to ensure all children are able to read proficiently by third grade. The requirements of the third grade reading guarantee include the requirement that kindergarten through third grade children be assessed by September 30 in the area of language and literacy to identify any children at risk for reading on grade level so they may receive intensive interventions and supports. The change in statute allows kindergarten teachers to use the language and literacy portion of the new kindergarten readiness assessment to meet this requirement thus allowing them to use one assessment to meet both requirements.

- **Expansion of Ohio's Public Preschool Program:**

In state fiscal year 2013, Ohio's public preschool program provided \$23.3 million to serve 5,700 children statewide at \$4,000 per child. House Bill 59 allocated an additional \$10 million (above the \$23.3 million) for academic year 2013-2014 to serve an additional 2,450 children at \$4,000 per child. In state fiscal year 2015, an additional \$12 million is provided that could serve an additional 2,940 children in this program. By state fiscal year 2015, a total of 11,090 preschool children from low income families will be served in this program. The statute expanded the eligible providers from public school districts to include community based child care providers and chartered non-public school programs as long as they are high quality defined as highly rated in Ohio's Step Up To Quality program.

- **Licensing Changes:**

Several licensing reforms and policy alignments occurred with the State Biennium Budget. Small family child care (Type B Home providers), wanting to or continuing to participate in the Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC) program, will be required to be licensed by the State of Ohio instead of maintain a county certification. Statute was modified to reflect this strategic change and rules were amended as well. In addition to the Type B Home provider changes, statute was also amended to have one set of policies on the requirement to complete a background check if working in an early care and education setting. ODJFS' section of statute was modified to align to ODE's requirement for a check to occur every five years.

- **Implementation of Five-Star TQRIS:**

Rules were modified to reflect the changes within Step Up To Quality. Two guidance documents for programs and family child care providers were developed and are available to assist programs and family child care providers with understanding the new standards and the registration and verification process. In addition, sample and prescribed forms were made available to programs and family child care providers to use in preparation for participating the in five-star system.

Participating State Agencies

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

There are no changes in the Participating State Agencies. With the hiring of the Early Education and Development Officer, the Governor's office continues its strong focus on Ohio's early learning and development reform agenda.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ohio completed the revision of its TQRIS in the first year of the grant which included revisions in this area. Please see the APR for year one for additional details.

Ohio has revised its QRIS program standards to reflect the desire for the field to be intentional with its instructional support, to implement screening, assessment and referral processes and to align curriculum and planning to age appropriate state early learning and development standards (ELDS). ODJFS, in collaboration with the Governor's Office, and Ohio Departments of Developmental Disabilities, Education, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services finalized the SUTQ program standards for implementation beginning on October 1, 2013. This revision modified Ohio's system from a Three-Star rating system using a building block approach to a Five-Star system using a combination model. In October 2013, programs licensed by ODE, including state public preschool sites and Preschool Special Education sites, became eligible to be rated for the first time. This allows Ohio to have a single framework for meeting quality program standards for all out of home early learning and development settings. Type B Homes were transitioned from certification to licensure in January 2014 and will become eligible for participation in SUTQ in July 2014.

Ohio continues to link SUTQ to its state licensing system by assuring programs are able to demonstrate a strong licensing compliance history in order to participate in SUTQ. ODJFS and ODE have worked together to align their licensing rules to designate serious risk non-compliances. ODJFS is currently developing serious risk non-compliances for Type B homes, which will begin participating in SUTQ in July 2014. The serious risk licensing non-compliances are designated as those that if violated, present the greatest risk of harm to children. Programs that have serious risk non-compliances are reviewed to determine if they are eligible to initially participate in SUTQ. Currently rated programs that have serious risk non-compliances are reviewed to determine if their star rating should be reduced or removed.

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.

During the revision of the TQRIS, agencies promoted the expansion, revision, and inclusion of stakeholder input through email, brochures, fact sheets, public website review, and advisory group advocacy. This process consisted of relevant website postings through earlychildhoodohio.org, Ohio Departments of Job and Family Services (ODJFS) and Education (ODE) email communications to programs and early childhood stakeholders, Child Care Advisory Committee advocacy, and the use of the Resource and Referral (R&R) Agency. ODJFS, ODE, and R&R staff provided technical assistance to any program interested in TQRIS revision education, preparation for initial participation, or expansion of a current star rating. In addition, ODJFS/ODE conducted regional trainings informing the public of the ELCG TQRIS changes and 'who to call' contact information to begin preparation. As materials were created for program reference, they were distributed to stakeholders for review and published on the Earlychildhoodohio.org website to prepare for the implementation of TQRIS.

A number of resource documents and web-based trainings have been created to assist programs in understanding the intent and requirements of the revised program standards, provide clarification around the verification policies and procedures, and explain the functionality of the new Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System (OCLQS) data system that programs use to register for SUTQ. All of these documents and trainings are posted on the earlychildhoodohio.org website.

With the implementation of the revised SUTQ five-star system, ODJFS and ODE continue to work with the above mentioned partners to promote additional participation. Regular meetings are scheduled with technical assistance and professional development providers to ensure there is on-going communication. These meetings have been invaluable for explaining implementation and policy decisions, sharing successful strategies in engaging programs, and identifying issues from the field where additional support and resources are needed.

As programs licensed by ODE begin participation in SUTQ, specific strategies have been developed to gradually phase in their participation. This phased-in approach is being used to allow resources to target identified programs. Two rounds of programs are being phased in for the 2013-2014 school year. A total of 120 ODE licensed and funded programs were identified for round one and asked to register for participation in SUTQ by December 2013. The second round of programs anticipated to include another 50 sites will be asked to register in the spring 2014. By gradually phasing in the participation of ODE programs, these programs are being provided technical assistance to prepare for the registration and verification process. The goal is that by the end of the grant period, all ODE licensed public preschool programs will be rated and over 50 percent of preschool special education programs will be rated (with 100 percent being rated by 2018 per statute).

With the inclusion of small family child care homes in SUTQ in July 2014, targeted technical assistance strategies are being created with the R&R's. The unique needs of small family child care homes have been identified in creating a plan that explains the philosophy and goals of a TQRIS, and promotes the continuous improvement process in engaging this population in participation. Local informational sessions are scheduled for the spring of 2014.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	99	33.0%	197	66.0%	269	90.0%
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	206	41.5%	220	44.0%	240	48.0%	255	51.0%	270	55.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	50	10.0%	126	25.0%	251	50.0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	804	39.0%	850	41.0%	933	45.0%	1,016	49.0%	1,050	51.0%
Other 1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	160	1.0%	330	2.0%
Describe:	Small family child care homes receiving funds from CCDF									
Other 2	270	12.0%	288	13.0%	311	14.0%	322	14.5%	333	15.0%
Describe:	Programs not receiving funds from CCDF and licensed by ODJFS									

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

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs									
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	299	0	0.0%	299	0	0.0%	326	0	0.0%
Specify:	Early Childhood Education								
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	496	206	41.5%	496	223	45.0%	592	274	46.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C									
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619		0	0.0%	502	0	0.0%	499	0	0.0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA									
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	2,074	804	39.0%	2,074	809	39.0%	2,946	1,027	35.0%
Other 1	6,600	0	0.0%	6,600	0	0.0%	3,999	0	0.0%
Describe:	Small family child care homes receiving funds from CCDF								
Other 2	2,220	270	12.0%	2,220	365	16.0%	1,548	405	26.0%
Describe:	Programs not receiving funds from CCDF and licensed by ODJFS								
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.									

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

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

The percentages for Year 2 may have changed from the original Targeted percentages based on the number of new programs reported in Year 2.

Of the 2,946 programs that received funds from the Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC) program are served children birth-5, 2,592 are ODJFS licensed and 177 are ODE licensed. 872 more programs, since the submission of Ohio's ELCG proposal, have voluntarily chosen to enter into a provider agreement with ODJFS to received PFCC funds.

In January 2014, Ohio eliminated a category of provider called, Type B Limited Provider. In addition, small family child care homes serving 6 or fewer children, receiving PFCC, were required to become licensed instead of certify by county DJFS. These requirements caused a massive clean-up to provider files and records, decreasing the number of reported providers.

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 order to support the implementation of Step Up To Quality from a three-star system, to a five-star system, the departments of Job and Family Services and Education have been working corroboratively to build a new data system. This system will be used by both departments to allow programs to register for Step Up To Quality; as well as by state staff to complete desk review and on-site verification visits. The system will also eventually be used to support the licensing functions of both departments. Due to the complexity of developing a comprehensive system that includes a web portal log-in for programs and an on-line registration process, there was a delay in implementation of this system. The system was initially scheduled to be operational in July 2013, but actually went into operation in October 2013, resulting in programs experiencing a delay in being able to submit an initial or increase registration. As stated previously, ODE identified two rounds of programs being phased in for the 2013-2014 school year. A total of 120 ODE licensed and funded programs were identified and registered for participation in SUTQ by December 2013. The program numbers were not included in the performance measure tables since they have not been rated, but all are starting the process and will be rated by June 30, 2014, thus putting ODE on schedule for programs being rated through Step Up To Quality.

We did not meet the goal of 99 public preschool programs and 50 IDEA Part B programs being rated by December 2013, but we are on-target for meeting those goals by June 2014 which is the conclusion of the 2013-2014 academic year. The delay in the system being operational had an impact on the registration process including, our ability to notify providers that they could begin the process of registration, as well as professional development and technical assistance around supporting system implementation. In an effort to keep in line with the timeline for rating programs within the same academic year, the decision was made to create a manual work around to assist programs in getting started in the process until the online system functionality was available. State staff worked closely with the identified ODE program providers to successfully complete the online registration process in December 2013. State staff are completing the desk review and onsite visit outside of the online system, which involves a longer than anticipated process of collecting and reviewing documents and accommodating program schedules to complete visits. Based upon our capacity, we leveraged many of the state staff responsible for visiting and rating programs to also participate in the development of the new functionality within the system. Programs are now receiving onsite visits and becoming rated. Resources have been reallocated to build capacity in bringing on more staff to complete this work, keeping us on schedule for rating programs in Step Up to Quality by June 2014. By June 2014, we expect to have rated 125 public preschool programs and 88 IDEA Part B funded programs.

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

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

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

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

ODJFS and ODE worked collaboratively to develop a staffing plan to assure licensing compliance and SUTQ rating verification visits are completed using an effective and efficient model. With the addition of two new tiers to the current rating system, a new monitoring schedule has been developed for SUTQ. One Star rated programs will be visited every year, two and three star rated programs will be visited every other year, and four and five star rated programs will be visited every three years. Two through five star rated programs will be required to submit an annual report, detailing progress made on goals identified in their continuous improvement plans, during years they do not receive an on-site monitoring visit. Professional development and training has occurred for both ODJFS and ODE staff responsible for assessing the program standards on how to reliably conduct on-site verification visits.

As part of the verification process, Ohio has created the Ohio Classroom Observation Tool (OCOT) to assess the quality of the classroom environment and staff/child interactions for programs that have registered for a three through five star rating. State staff who will be completing the OCOT have undergone extensive training and have established reliability in the use of the tool. The development process for the OCOT has included numerous opportunities to gather validity evidence to support its use in Ohio's TQIRS. The development process began with a literature review of the research and development of other existing classroom environment and interaction rating tools. Once the initial set of items was established, we created a crosswalk between the OCOT and other similar measures, such as the ECERS-R and the Pre-K CLASS. The OCOT development team piloted the first version of the OCOT in a small number of classrooms throughout the state that represented the maximum variation in program types. The data from the first pilot led to a number of changes in the items. The revised version was then completed across a number of classrooms that serve preschool students along with concurrent ratings using similar tools (i.e. ECERS-R, Pre-K CLASS, and ELLCO). Ohio will continue to analyze OCOT data along with data from other similar tools completed concurrently with the OCOT to further document its validity as a measure of classroom quality.

A contract was awarded for a vendor to train ODJFS, ODE and technical assistance staff on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) and the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS). The CLASS and ERS will be used as part of the evaluation and validation process in order to gain information on structural quality and teacher/child interactions at each tier of the rating. Additionally, they will be used in the technical assistance process for quality improvement planning.

The creation of a new data system, which is used by staff from both ODE and ODJFS and which began in fall 2013, will include an inspection tool that will eventually allow staff to complete licensing and SUTQ monitoring visits at the same time. The data system will allow staff to complete the licensing inspection and SUTQ verification visit while at the program and email a copy of the compliance results to the program for posting onsite. This will provide families enrolled at the program with timely information about licensing compliance and SUTQ rating results. The ODJFS website currently includes information about Step Up To Quality and the importance of high quality early learning and development settings. Licensing inspection findings and information about a program's star rating are searchable by multiple criteria, including a program's location and star rating level. When the new database is operational, this feature also will be used for ODE licensed programs, as well as small family child care homes. The rating information will then be posted on a combined searchable database on Ohio's earlychildhoodohio.org website. The information on program quality obtained from this data system will also be linked to child outcome information, including formative assessments and Kindergarten Readiness Assessment.

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?

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

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
5

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

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level	0	*	42	0	0	233	8
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	0	*	4	0	0	109**	1**

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

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

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

The following notes are related to the above program numbers.

* Early Head Start and Head Start numbers referenced above are not able to be reported separately, combined numbers reported under Head Start Programs and include Early Head Start and Head Start.

** Regarding programs receiving CCDF, 47 of the 109 centers and the 1 Family Child Care listed above went to a no rating because they closed, none of these are Head Start programs.

On October 1, 2013, Ohio implemented revisions to SUTQ which includes the addition of two tier levels, moving from a three to a five star system. The top three tiers of SUTQ are considered to be the highest levels of quality. At this level, classrooms are observed to verify that programs understand and can implement a comprehensive curriculum that addresses all developmental domains and is aligned to the Early Learning and Development Standards. In addition, programs are observed to determine if they are implementing a comprehensive assessment that is aligned to standards and is used to inform instruction. Classrooms also are observed to ensure a quality classroom environment that addresses the needs, abilities and interests of all students and provides positive adult child interactions.

Please see the APR for the first year of the grant for more details on Ohio's development of high-quality benchmarks at the highest levels of SUTQ.

With the addition of two new tiers to the current rating system, a new monitoring schedule has been developed for SUTQ. One Star rated programs will be visited every year, two and three star rated programs will be visited every other year, and four and five star rated programs will be visited every three years. Two through five star rated programs will be required to submit an annual report, detailing progress made on goals identified in their

continuous improvement plans, during years they do not receive an on-site monitoring visit. The creation of a new data system, which is used by staff from both ODE and ODJFS and began in fall 2013, will include an inspection tool that will eventually allow staff to complete licensing and SUTQ monitoring visits at the same time. The data system will allow staff to complete the licensing inspection and SUTQ verification visit while at the program and email a copy of the compliance results to the program for posting onsite. This will provide families enrolled at the program with timely information about licensing compliance and SUTQ rating results. The ODJFS website currently includes information about Step Up To Quality and the importance of high quality early learning and development settings. Licensing inspection findings and information about a program's star rating are searchable by multiple criteria, including a program's location and star rating level. When the new database is operational, this feature also will be used for ODE licensed programs, as well as small family child care homes. The information on program quality obtained from this data system will also be linked to child outcome information, including formative assessments and Kindergarten Readiness Assessment information, to inform decision-making about investments and further funding.

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

In the table, 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.

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline	Targets				Actuals	
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	1,074	1,358	1,643	1,986	2,528	1,200	1,432
Number of Programs in Tier 1	548	679	450	375	425	520	690
Number of Programs in Tier 2	320	405	375	400	520	402	0
Number of Programs in Tier 3	206	274	338	590	713	278	431
Number of Programs in Tier 4			270	375	500		311
Number of Programs in Tier 5			210	246	370		0

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

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

The number of rated programs were pulled from the Step Up To Quality database and the newly created Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System (OCLQS).

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

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

The revised TQRIS was not implemented until October 1, 2013. This included the creation of a new data system that is used by programs to submit a registration for participation. During Year 2 due to the transition from the 3-star to the 5-star TQRIS, there were approximately five months when programs were not able to initially register or to request an increased rating. The five month time period allowed staff to complete verification visits with programs that had registered under the 3-star system and for the existing data system to be converted to the new data system. In addition, staff from both departments participated in training sessions on the implementation of the new 5-star system, including common verification. ODE and ODJFS have both developed recruitment strategies and anticipate to continue to increase the number of rated programs. The greatest challenges to achieving the goals include staff capacity for completing the on-site inspections and the automation of the registration, on-site and rating verification process.

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

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

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

Targets										
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,881	33.0%	3,762	66.0%	5,130	90.0%
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	4,711	12.0%	6,304	16.0%	9,850	25.0%	15,760	40.0%	21,670	55.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2,333	10.0%	5,834	25.0%	11,668	50.0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	7,369	15.0%	7,667	16.0%	8,146	17.0%	8,625	18.0%	9,639	20.0%
Other 1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	480	3.0%	990	6.0%
Describe:	Small family child care homes									
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.										

Actuals									
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	5,700	0	0.0%	5,700	0	0.0%	5,700	0	0.0%
Specify:	Early Childhood Education								
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	39,383	4,711	12.0%	39,383	11,474	29.0%	39,106	18,974	48.0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C									
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	23,336	0	0.0%	23,336	0	0.0%	24,048	0	0.0%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA									
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	47,920	7,369	15.0%	47,920	9,947	21.0%	65,049	11,027	17.0%
Other 1	15,000	0	0.0%	15,000	0	0.0%	13,312	0	0.0%
Describe:	Small family child care homes								
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.									

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

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

The percentages for Year 2 may have changed from the original Targeted percentages based on the increase in the number of new programs reported in Year 2.

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

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

The revised TQRIS was not implemented until October 1, 2013. Programs that were rated on October 1, 2013 under the three-star system were transitioned into a rating under the new five-star system. Programs who have achieved a three to five-star rating are considered highly rated in Ohio's TQRIS.

The previous three-star standards were aligned to the new five-star standards. Based on a review of the alignment, it was determined that previous two-star standards most closely aligned with the new three-star standards, and the previous three-star standards most closely aligned with the new four-star standards. Therefore, one-star programs remained a one-star, while two-star programs became three-star rated programs and three-star programs became four-star rated programs in the five-star system. This transition explains why

there aren't any two or five star programs yet. Publicly funded preschool programs licensed by ODE (i.e., public preschool and preschool special education) are registered and beginning the process to be rated during the 2013-2014 school year which will put us back on schedule for meeting performance measures.

In calculating the percentage of CCDF programs that are participating in the TQRIS, the number of total CCDF programs was re-baselined from the original grant application numbers to reflect the number of programs with active provider agreements as of December 2013. During Years 1 and 2 of the ELCG, 874 more providers have voluntarily chosen to enter into a provider agreement with ODJFS to receive PFCC funds. In addition, the number of star rated programs increased during Year 2 from 1,200 to 1,432. After using the re-baselined numbers, the calculated percentages were modified. Therefore the number of children participating in CCDF funded programs exceeded our target but the percentage remained the same. Due to the delay in rating public preschool and IDEA part B programs, Ohio did not meet its targets this year for number of children in programs rated in the top tiers. However, Ohio expects to meet these targets by June 2014 when 125 public preschool programs and 88 IDEA part B programs will be rated in Step Up To Quality and expected to be in the top tiers.

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.

Leadership team members from ODE and ODJFS have begun working on the RFP for the validation of the revisions to SUTQ. A logic model and research questions have been drafted and conversations with the Ohio Department of Administrative Services have assisted in developing a timeline for completion of the RFP. Ohio is a BUILD state and we worked with BUILD to convene a group of national experts to consult with us on the use of classroom observation tools as part of the verification process. BUILD has provided technical assistance and resources regarding best practice and recommendations around building an effective validation study as well.

Ohio worked with a national expert on TQRIS and reviewed other states' standards and national research to inform the development of the benchmarks within each level or tier. In addition, Ohio reviewed the evaluation studies conducted previously on Ohio's three-tier model. Ohio plans to use reliable observers through the validation contract to conduct Environmental Rating Scales and Classroom Assessment Scoring System on rated and non-rated programs to evaluate differentiated levels of quality for programs participating in SUTQ. Finally, Ohio plans to examine child assessment information as part of its validation study in relation to observational measures to inform the extent the tiers are tied to differential levels of program quality.

All children participating in publicly-funded programs will be assigned a unique student identifier (SSID) that protects individual identities and is utilized for all children in grades preschool to post-secondary. This identifier will eventually allow Ohio to be able to map the early learning and development experiences for children through to the universal kindergarten readiness assessment. Ohio will be able to analyze if children that participated in a highly-rated program produced better results on the kindergarten readiness assessment than peers that did not. In addition, as the SSID is implemented we will be able to analyze not only performance on the kindergarten readiness assessment but also performance on the third grade Ohio Achievement Assessment. This will allow Ohio to associate not only early childhood program quality information, but also school report card performance information, particularly our new performance measure in K-3 literacy progress, with longitudinal student performance data so we can better tie child outcomes to the quality of children's educational experiences from birth to grade three and beyond.

By spring 2015, all programs participating in SUTQ that are rated at a tier three or higher will be required to enter child assessment data into the new Ohio Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS), using the child's SSID number. Programs that are rated 1 or 2 will be asked to become familiar with assessments and participate in training to ensure they are prepared to administer assessments as they move to a 3, 4 or 5 star rating. The use of the EC-CAS and the SSID will protect children's privacy while allowing for the examination of child progress and evaluation of kindergarten readiness for children who are enrolled in programs that are highly rated. Ohio intends only to fund high quality programs.

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

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

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

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

Has the State made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards:

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

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

Tools to Support Use of Birth to Kindergarten Entry Standards

All early learning and development programs in Ohio have completed or are in the process of fully integrating the new early learning and development standards into their curricula and classroom practices. The professional development coordination workgroup of state agencies including Departments of Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Developmental Disabilities, Education and Job and Family Services approved the final recommendations for the Model Curricula for the Early Learning and Development Standards which are called "Implementation Guides." The use of these guides support programs in implementing the standards in conjunction with their curriculum. In addition, the Curriculum Standards Assessment Alignment Tool was revised by cross agency staff members to align with the new child and program standards. The Tool is used to support the alignment of the Early Learning and Development standards to a program's child assessments and a program's curriculum.

Professional Development

Ohio is also supporting the implementation of the standards through professional development. Ohio identified and secured an external provider responsible for coordination of professional development delivery through Ohio state and regional networks. Ohio Early Learning and Development Standards Professional Development Modules were developed to support the implementation of the Birth to Kindergarten Entry Early Learning and Development Standards. The Modules are leveled and begin with an overview of standards-based education and an introduction to the Early Learning and Development Standards. Then as participants move to Level 2 and Level 3 of this professional development, they engage in specific content on each domain based on age level (birth through 36 months and 36 months to kindergarten entry). The new professional development modules are being deployed in Ohio through four key networks which are supported through the Ohio Departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health and Mental Health and Addiction Services respectively. The networks include State Support Teams, Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, Health Promotion Consultants, and Early Childhood Mental Health Consultants. The regional professional development networks were provided train-the-trainer training on the first module in June 2013 and following this provided the training to early learning professionals across the state. In August 2013, the regional networks were provided train-the-trainer

training on the remaining modules and are deploying training on these modules to professionals serving children birth to kindergarten entry throughout Ohio. In 2013, a total of 10,899 professionals were trained through these new training modules.

Kindergarten to Grade 3 Standards & Model Curriculum

Writing teams comprised of stakeholders and experts have been selected to assist with crafting standards and model curricula for K-3 in the areas of Approaches Toward Learning, Physical Well-being and Motor Development and Social-Emotional Development. These teams will also review current K-12 physical education standards and recommend changes and or expansions to K-3 standards to address the content within Ohio's physical well-being and motor development standards for birth to K entry. A cross agency leadership team met in May 2013 to make recommendations on how the writing process should proceed including identification of writing team members, structure of the standards, and implementation of the standards in Ohio. Writing teams met in January 2014 to work on the development of the standards. Next steps will include finalization of the standards and review for public comment and input.

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

Has the State made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to:

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

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.

Cross-State Agency Professional Development Committee

The cross-agency professional development committee including Ohio Departments of Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Developmental Disabilities, Education, Job and Family Services, and the Governor's office meet 1-2 times per month. The group identified priorities for implementation of cross agency professional development which included aligning professional development for early childhood across State Agencies. The group also created cross agency professional development approval policies. The cross-state agency professional development committee reviews and prioritizes professional development needs for the state. Two of the state agencies on the committee fund and lead two of the regional professional development networks that will be providing the EC-CAS professional development to early childhood professionals and kindergarten teachers. The committee reviews the train-the-trainer model, determines requirements, and reviews ongoing implementation to ensure the regional networks successfully deliver the EC-CAS professional development.

Professional Development Coordination

A contract for Professional Development Coordination was awarded in October 2013 with the goal of adding capacity to our existing regional professional networks and developing new professional development modules that focus on supporting early childhood professionals' use of screenings and assessments, work with young English Language Learners and the use of technology in the early childhood setting. To add more capacity to the regional networks, 12 Regional Professional Development Coordinators have been hired to work collaboratively in particular regions of the state with the networks which include Child Care Resource and Referral (R& R) staff, State Support Teams (SST), Health Promotion Consultants, and Early Childhood Mental Health Consultants. The Professional Development Coordinators will serve as a support for regional collaboration among professional development entities as well as serve in the role of Early Childhood coaches to selected protégés. They have received instruction in the "Teacher/Leader" coaching model which will support their work with protégés.

Early Childhood Mental Health Consultants and Health Promotion Consultants

Two of the above regional professional development networks are supported through the Early Learning Challenge Grant, one network includes 17 Early Childhood Mental Health Consultants, led by the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, and the second network includes the 10 Health Promotion Consultants led by the Ohio Department of Health. The Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services worked with local early childhood mental health boards to secure the early childhood mental health consultants. These consultants work with existing providers serving children with high needs to support early childhood professionals' use of standards and assessments related to social and emotional development and approaches toward learning. During June and August of 2013, many of these consultants participated in the Early Learning and Development Standards Train the Trainer. They have been working closely with the CCR&Rs as well as SSTs to determine services needed in their area and to collaborate on providing professional development. The Ohio Department of Health has secured health promotion consultants to work throughout Ohio to support early childhood professionals' use of standards and assessments related to physical well-being and health. The health promotion consultants have coordinated training dates and secured training locations within their region. Consultants are contacting programs and promoting their services with the intent of scheduling on-site trainings and technical assistance visits. Early childhood mental health consultants and health promotion consultants will continue to work with other regional professional development providers within their assigned regions to promote collaboration in professional development delivery to the early childhood system within their regions.

Supporting the use of the Comprehensive Assessment System

Through the Maryland-Ohio collaboration for the design and implementation of a Comprehensive Assessment System, professional development will be available to early childhood educators through multiple methods including face-to-face trainings, online trainings and communities of practice. This professional development will support the pre-administration of the assessment, administration, and interpretation and use of the assessment data after administration. In September through November 2013, Ohio and Maryland completed a pilot of the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment professional development system. In the spring of 2014, both states will pilot formative assessment professional development components of the system. The full-scale roll out of the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment professional development system will begin in April of 2014, followed by the Formative Assessment components in the fall of 2014.

Supporting the Use of Screening and Assessment Tools

Ohio has designed a professional development series to support the use of assessment in programs serving children birth through kindergarten entry. Professional development that explains what standards-based education is and how it relates to assessment will strengthen early childhood educators' understanding of the

connection between standards and assessments was completed in August 2013. Training modules that address the purpose of assessments and how assessments support positive learning experiences for children birth through kindergarten entry were in development as of December 2013 including:

- An introduction to screenings and assessments related to health and development, including the difference between screening and assessment, purposes and uses and assessing technical adequacy;
- Choosing appropriate screenings for children from birth to kindergarten entry, including an overview of screenings for targeted populations and how to determine appropriate screenings, the use of screening results and communicating results to families;
- Assessing children from birth through kindergarten entry, including the overview of the purposes and uses of assessment, methods for collecting and interpreting information and using information to inform instruction.

Ohio anticipates this training and support course materials being available for early childhood educators in June of 2014.

Supporting the use of Measures of Environmental Quality and Measures of Adult-Child Interactions

Ohio has a two-part strategy for ensuring the quality of classroom environments and adult-child interactions in those environments: using a classroom quality screener at the state Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System level and using more in-depth classroom quality measures at the program/technical assistance level. In 2013, Ohio developed a new classroom observation tool to use as part of our updated Tiered Quality and Rating and Improvement System called Step Up To Quality. The new tool, called the Ohio Classroom Observation Tool (OCOT), was designed to quickly determine whether a classroom meets a minimum quality standard for a mid-level rating in Step Up To Quality. The tool allows Ohio to assess the quality of a large number of classes across the state. Ohio will also provide training on off-the-shelf valid and reliable measures of adult-child interactions and environmental quality. In 2014, Ohio will train regional professional development providers, such as State Support Team personnel and Child Care Resource and Referral consultants to reliably administer the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) as well as the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS) that target infants, toddlers, preschool and family childcare. Providers will use these tools to create positive learning environments and foster positive interactions within those environments.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

Has the State made progress in developing:

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

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

Ohio has a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework called Ohio's Early Childhood Core Knowledge & Competencies (CKC) and a CKC Instructor Guide that have been used widely among child care providers. However district preschool programs have used Ohio's K-12 Educators Standards rather than Ohio's CKC. Similarly, Ohio's two-year higher education institutions have primarily prepared pre-service teachers using the Ohio CKC, while Ohio's four-year higher education institutions have primarily used the Ohio K-12 Educator Standards. Part of Ohio's RTT-ELC work includes a plan to review and revise Ohio's CKC and ensure they are utilized by professional development providers, higher education and local program providers in all sectors. This plan is being supported through a partnership with the Early Childhood Advisory Council.

Ohio implemented the following activities in 2013:

- Revised and expanded the CKC to reflect the expansion of the Early Learning and Development Standards birth to kindergarten entry, revision to the TQRIS program standards and the plans for the Comprehensive Assessment System. Ohio has an active professional development stakeholder group, the Ohio Professional Development Network (OPDN) that also includes state agency staff members. OPDN led the revision of the current CKC draft document and CKC instructor guide to meet the newly revamped QRIS model and the Early Learning and Development Standards. The draft is being reviewed by a cross agency leadership team to determine what further revisions should be made before finalized and posted for public comment;
- Drafted a bridging document to assist early childhood professionals, faculty and professional development providers with understanding the purpose and content of the CKC and the alignment to the K-12 Educator Standards. As the CKC document is finalized the bridging document will be updated to reflect the final version;
- Report drafted that documents the current progression and availability of degrees and credentials for early childhood professionals;
- Created a plan to convene a meeting with Ohio Board of Regents and the Governor's office to plan and identify strategies on how we can engage higher education faculty with opportunities for training and education related to the advancements in Early Learning and Development Standards birth to kindergarten entry, revision to the TQRIS program standards and the plans for the Comprehensive Assessment System. The goal is to help faculty develop ways to incorporate the Core Knowledge and Competencies into their coursework. ODE and ODJFS co-hosted a meeting in June 2013 to introduce the new standards to two and four higher education institutions.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

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

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

The domains included in Ohio's new Kindergarten Readiness Assessment are Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Language and Literacy, Physical Well-Being and Motor Development, and Social Foundations (which includes social emotional development, approaches toward learning, and executive functioning).

Ohio, Maryland, and our assessment development partners are employing an iterative process to ensure the technical adequacy of the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment. Through quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis over the phases of assessment design, development, and implementation, extensive evidence has been gathered, and will continue to be gathered, to document the validity and reliability of the assessment results for determining the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry. Specifically, we engaged experts and stakeholders (national technical advisory committee, state and local advisory councils, stakeholder and expert ad hoc committees, and a multi-partner leadership team) in the assessment design and development phases and will continue to seek their input throughout the implementation phase.

We completed three phases of piloting with kindergarten students and teachers. Phase one, the cognitive interviews, were conducted in January 2013. In phase one, 14 Ohio students and 14 Ohio Teachers provided feedback on item prototypes. Phase two, the pilot, was completed in April 2013. One hundred sixty one students and 27 teachers participated in the pilot that included items from 4 of the 6 Kindergarten Readiness Assessment domains. The assessment vendor used the results of both the cognitive interviews and the pilot to make data-driven changes to item types, content, wording, graphics, and administration procedures. Phase

three, a large scale field test was completed in November and December 2013. Nearly 3500 Ohio Students and 127 teachers participated in the field test, which included all six domains. In 2014, we will review the data from phase three (the field test) to identify the final set of items for statewide administration and develop scoring and reporting components for the statewide administration.

The administration window for Ohio's Kindergarten Readiness Assessment is set in state statute as “not earlier than the first day of the school year and not later than the first day of November” and will be administered beginning in fall 2014 for all Ohio kindergarten students statewide

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.

Ohio, in collaboration with Maryland, has already made measureable progress in the development of its Kindergarten Readiness Assessment. In 2013, three phases of piloting were completed with assessment items. The results of the third phase, the field test, will be used to identify the final set of assessment items for statewide administration in 2014, along with scoring and reporting components of the assessment. Additionally, professional development and teacher-level technology components of the assessment were field tested in 2013. In the spring of 2014, Ohio will complete field testing of the child-level technology components of the assessment. Ohio's statewide administration of the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment including all related professional development and technology components will be completed in 2014.

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

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

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

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

Essential Data Elements and Status of Early Childhood Coordinated Data System

The state already collects the essential data elements that are necessary to support the development of an Early Childhood Coordinated Data System. In 2013, Ohio continued work on multiple projects to support and enhance this objective. All of the program, workforce, and child data exist among the different state agencies of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, and Developmental Disabilities. Through several projects in RTT-ELC, Ohio is building on the data elements with a primary focus on being able to share and exchange data across agencies.

Enabling Uniform Data Collection and Easy Entry of the Essential Data Elements; Facilitating the Exchange of Data Among Participating State Agencies

Child Link System Status

Ohio is implementing a project that will ensure all children in publicly-funded early learning and development programs are assigned the same unique student identification number that is also used for children in grades prekindergarten to post-secondary in Ohio. Data attached to this number will not include personally identifiable information, thus protecting each child's privacy and no information will be shared with the federal government. Ohio legislation effective July 2012 mandated the use of this student identification number by state agencies that serve children birth to kindergarten entry in publicly funded early learning and development programs. This project funds the information technology infrastructure for assigning the unique identification number which

will enable state agencies to share information and data across the birth to kindergarten entry age spectrum and link it to K-12 as well.

The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS) who is responsible for publicly funded child care administration completed system development and is scheduled to begin issuing and storing SSIDs in February 2014. Ohio will now have a common identifier (SSID) for children in Part B and C of IDEA, child care and public preschool which is also utilized at the K-12 and post-secondary levels. The Ohio Department of Health who already issues SSIDs for children in Part C - IDEA, has identified some system enhancements that can be made to their data system that issue and stores SSIDs to ensure accuracy.

State Longitudinal Data System/P-20 Repository Status

ODE is currently working with the Ohio Board of Regents (BOR) to build and deploy a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS). The SLDS --or the P20 Repository as it is commonly referred to --is in the development and loading stages of the project. We requested and received a one year grant extension to June 2014. The data from the systems has been grouped by content and prioritized based on the criticality of the data, operational capacity and agency schedules. At this time, the agencies have finished the work of loading the first three groups of data --out of 9 total groupings. This includes BOR Higher Education Institutions key data, which is most of the student enrollment, coursework, entrance and general organizational data from the BOR database, ODE educator data and general organizational data from the ODE databases. The remaining groups are in various stages of development due to other initiatives taking priority over the P20 SLDS development. ODE will continue to load the remaining groups of P12 data as they are completed. The P-20 repository is scheduled to be fully loaded and work complete by June 30, 2014.

In coordination with the building of the P-20 Repository, ODE and BOR have been working on a data governance structure that will support the use of the P-20. Legislation was passed in Ohio prior to all the work on the P-20 stipulating that each agency will continue to own their own data, and that prior to the deployment of the P-20 there would be a governance structure and a strategic plan. The Data Governance Manual and policy is still a draft version and not approved yet. That manual and policy has to be signed by both agencies before the first production data can be shared. The P-20 strategic plan is in the final draft stages but not approved yet. It must be completed with signatures before the first production data can be shared.

Generation of Information that is Timely, Relevant, Accessible and Easy to Use for Continuous Improvement and Decision-making

Child Identification Number

By leveraging key cross-state agency projects and using RTT-ELC funding to expand upon existing early learning data system infrastructure, Ohio will be able to generate information that is timely, relevant and accessible for state agencies, local programs and early childhood educators. By implementing the unique privacy-protected child identification number for all children in publicly-funded programs, Ohio will be able to link information across programs, agencies and funding streams. Implementing a cross-agency memorandum of understanding that clarifies the sharing and use of information, will allow the agencies to begin providing answers to critical policy and research questions.

Step Up To Quality Data System

Ohio has implemented a data system for its tiered quality rating and improvement system called Step Up To Quality (SUTQ) which contains program quality data for ODE and ODJFS funded programs across the two agencies. This data is based on Ohio's SUTQ program standards which will allow for a common way of evaluating

quality of early childhood programs. This system will also be expanded in 2015 to include licensing data for ODE and ODJFS funded and licensed programs across the two agencies which when implemented will also ensure compliance with basic health and safety standards addressed through licensing. Through work accomplished in 2013, programs now have access to the new SUTQ data system. The Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System (OCLQS) is a web-based system that allows programs to register for a star rating and monitor their continuous improvement efforts through SUTQ. We will eventually be able to track compliance history of health and safety standards through reports that are generated after a licensing or SUTQ visit. In addition, families and members of the public will have access to online information about the quality of early childhood programs.

Maryland and Ohio EC-CAS Data System

State programs will have access to a data system that will house aggregated child assessment information in all domains of school readiness at the prekindergarten and kindergarten level through the Maryland and Ohio Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System Project. Early childhood programs from all sectors including districts, child care and family child care will use a standardized technology infrastructure to input child assessment results into Ohio's longitudinal data system and ODJFS' early childhood assessment database. Programs licensed or funded through ODE and ODJFS will be able to immediately access this child assessment information in a way that will assist them in making instructional decisions and sharing information with families. State level decision-makers also will have access to aggregate information that does not include personal student information for districts, programs, regions and the states.

During the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment field test in November and December 2013, Kindergarten Teachers in Ohio and Maryland piloted a field test version of the assessment data system. The field test version included access to items and fields for inputting scores and comments. Teachers reported their experience with the data system through an online survey completed in December 2013. Additionally, the field test provided an opportunity to pilot student-level data sharing between Ohio school districts and the assessment data system. A Memorandum of Understanding was put in place in October 2013 for the sharing of student-level data between Ohio schools and the new assessment data system.

Meets Data System Oversight Requirements and Federal, State and Local Privacy Laws

Each of the agencies have data governance policies in place, but new cross-agency governance committees are being established to address data sharing and confidentiality. Section 1347.15 of the Ohio Revised Code requires each state agency to adopt rules related to accessing confidential personal information and designation of an individual who serves as the data privacy point of contact. The rules adopted by the various state agencies are to ensure compliance with all applicable federal and state privacy/confidentiality laws including, but not limited to, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), Gramm- Leach-Bliley Act (GLB), Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and IDEA. Additionally, the state of Ohio has established an information technology standard that specifies the minimum requirements for information security in all agencies, and identifies the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publication 800-53, revision 3 (NIST 800-53) as the framework for information security controls implementation for the state. Early efforts are underway to initiate different projects that will address cross-agency and global data system oversight requirements.

Cross-Agency Memorandum of Understanding on Data Sharing and Use

Ohio participating state agencies are finalizing a general data sharing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the agencies cooperating on the RTT ELC grant. The MOU will be a general data sharing agreement between the agencies that will provide a framework and overall commitment for sharing data. The draft MOU has been shared with agencies leadership and legal departments and is currently in its final draft stage and will next be

sent to each agencies legal department for final approval. The final version with signatures is projected to be in place by March 2014.

Strategies to Ensure Measurable Progress

At both the state and federal levels, there is an enhanced focus and significant investment on strengthening decision support for early childhood development in order to support school readiness. Recent changes to state policies, such as requiring a Statewide Student Identification Number (SSID) for early childhood publicly-funded programs, are establishing a foundation for enabling data linkages, integration and sharing that have not been possible in the past. State of Ohio initiatives such as RTT-ELC and the Integrated Eligibility and Health and Human Services (HHS) Business Intelligence Project will establish the technical infrastructure and capabilities for supporting cross-system data sharing and integration on a statewide basis. To support this focus and investment, various projects described above have been initiated. These projects will create the foundational artifacts needed to support an enterprise level and cross-agency early learning and data sharing system.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development

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

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income ¹ families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	67,331	8.0%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	134,662	16.0%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	216,620	25.0%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	418,613	49.0%

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

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

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

National Center for Children in Poverty, 50-State Data reports calculated from the 2011 American Community Survey, representing information from 2011. State data were calculated from the 2009-2011 American Community Survey, representing information from the years 2009 to 2011. Children are defined as poor if family income is below the federal poverty level. The National Center for Children in Poverty 2010 report was used to report last year's data and because a different data source was used by NCCP in their 2010 report, there is an increase in the number of children birth to kindergarten entry reported for this year.

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

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs		
Special Populations: Children who...	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays ¹	35,121	4.1%
Are English learners ²	24,728	3.0%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	0	0.0%
Are migrant ³	1,000	0.12%
Are homeless ⁴	7,228	1.0%
Are in foster care	4,428	0.5%

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

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

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

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

Data Table (A)(1)-2 Data Notes

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

Poverty data is from National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP)

The number of children who have disabilities or developmental delays has decreased due to a program being phased out and new rules for two other programs in Part C that have decreased eligibility.

Migrant data is from the 2012-2013 Head Start Program Information Report.

Foster care data is from the Office of Families and Children's IV-B plan report survey - October 1, 2013.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool			5,700*	5,700*
Specify:	Early Childhood Education			
Data Source and Year:	Slots offered statewide through Early Childhood Education Entitlement Grant			
Early Head Start & Head Start¹	1,387	3,905	33,814	39,106
Data Source and Year:	Ohio Head Start FY 13			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	1,599	9,474	24,048	35,121
Data Source and Year:	Part C Child Count Report December 2013 and December Child Count 12/1/13 (EMIS FY13)			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA		13	26,296	26,309
Data Source and Year:	CSPR School Report for FY13			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	13,319	21,384	43,524	78,227
Data Source and Year:	Child Care Information Data Systems (CCIDS) - 2013			
Other 1	2,577	2,430		5,007
Specify:	Home Visiting			
Data Source and Year:	ODH - Early Track Child Count - 2013			
Other 2				15,616
Specify:	Mental Health Treatment from Public Mental Health System			
Data Source and Year:	Multi-Agency Community Services System (MACSIS) - 2013			

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

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

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

Multi Agency Community Services Information System (MACSIS) for Mental Health Treatment from Public Mental Health System is only able to provide the Total Participation of Children with High Needs.

CCDF: The number used reflects the monthly averages for calendar year 2013 (January - December 2013).

Home Visiting numbers have decreased due to system changes which reduced eligibility for this program.

*Note: In 2013-2014 school year, an additional \$10 million was allocated to Early Childhood Education which added 2,450 more children to Ohio's public preschool program. However, the 5,700 in the chart reflect the 2012-2013 school year/FY 2013.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Hispanic Children	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	267	10	28	710	10	348	4,340
Specify:	ECE						
Early Head Start & Head Start ¹	3,387	294	313	12,984	101	3,519	17,102
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	422	25	139	1,718	12	491	8,266
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,121	14	338	2,852	14	1,120	18,589
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	1,493	19	182	5,286	23	1,493	18,092
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	3,576	50	225	34,802	41	3,509	22,846
Other 1	302	15	34	1,394	10	319	2,669
Describe:	Home Visiting						
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.							

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

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

Mental Health Treatment from Public Mental Health System should be included in the table above and has the following breakout reported from its Multi Agency Community Services Information System (MACSIS): 4,561 - African American; 10,878 - White; 296 - Unknown/Other.

CCDF numbers are for children who received services in December of 2013. Table (A)(1)-3a reflects the monthly averages for calendar year 2013 (January - December 2013). Also, caretakers are not required to identify a race/ethnicity so this table's total will not total Table (A)(1)-3a.

Due to Department data reporting rules, counts of less than 10 students have been entered as a count of 10. Head Start and Early Head Start counts included 1,406 children coded as "Unknown or Other".

Some of the Race/Ethnicity totals by program reported do not match the number of children served in table Table (A)(1)-3a. Data systems for the following programs: IDEA Part B; Title I of ESEA; CCDF and Home Visiting do not have an unduplicated count of children by Race/Ethnicity and a child may count in two different categories.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year			
Type of investment	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start¹	\$0	\$0	
State-funded preschool	\$23,268,341	\$23,268,341	\$23,268,341
Specify:	ECE		
State contributions to IDEA, Part C	\$9,933,144	\$10,105,050	\$10,279,696
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$85,459,542	\$85,459,542	\$103,000,000
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$84,732,478	\$84,682,658	\$84,732,730
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Met	Met
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>			
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$261,614,496	\$251,657,792	\$257,665,313
Other State contributions 1	\$27,716,856	\$23,568,495	\$23,393,877
Specify:	Help Me Grow (non-Part C)		
Other State contributions 2	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
Specify:	Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation		
Other State contributions 3	\$133,131,501	\$123,643,393	\$123,596,474
Specify:	State GRF - ALI Early Care and Education used for Publicly Funded Child Care		
Total State contributions:	\$626,056,358	\$602,585,271	\$626,136,431
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.

The funding information provided for Year Two is for State Fiscal Year 2013 which runs July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013.

In the 2012 Annual Performance Report (APR) "Total State contributions" included the actual amount for "State match to CCDF" for Baseline and Year One. In the 2013 APR, "State match to CCDF" no longer asks for an amount but whether the state match was "Exceeded/Met/Not Met". In order to be consistent across all years, the "Total State contributions" has been re totaled for Baseline and Year One to no longer include the amount for "State match to CCDF" but rather to reflect that it was "Met".

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

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

Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program¹			
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2
State-funded preschool <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	5,700	5,700	5,700
Early Head Start and Head Start² <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	39,383	39,181	39,106
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	37,256	36,886	35,121
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>	21,658	25,727	26,309
Programs receiving CCDF funds <i>(average monthly served)</i>	62,920	77,774	78,227
Other 1	7,881	6,133	5,007
Describe:	Home Visiting Program		
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.

For Early Head Start and Head Start, Fiscal Year 2013 information was inadvertently reported out for Fiscal Year 2012. Number should have been 39,181 for year 1 and should be 39,106 in year two.

The number of children in IDEA Part C has decreased due to a program being phased out and new rules for two other programs in Part C that have decreased eligibility.

CCDF numbers are for children who received services in December of 2013.

Mental Health Treatment from Public Mental Health System should be included in the table above and has the following breakout reported from its Multi Agency Community Services Information System (MACSIS): 13,281 - Baseline; 14,114 - Year One; 15,616 - Year Two.

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

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

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

The State Board of Education adopted Ohio's Birth to Kindergarten Entry Early Learning and Development Standards in October of 2012 which address all Essential Domains of School Readiness.

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

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

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

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

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

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

None.

Budget and Expenditure Tables

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

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

Budget Summary Table

Budget Summary Table			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$152,969	\$825,499	\$978,468
2. Fringe Benefits	\$76,980	\$315,819	\$392,799
3. Travel	\$7,269	\$12,853	\$20,122
4. Equipment	\$1,534	\$8,589	\$10,123
5. Supplies	\$1,593	\$3,436	\$5,029
6. Contractual	\$180,181	\$13,932,337	\$14,112,518
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$309,191	\$309,191
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$420,526	\$15,407,723	\$15,828,249
10. Indirect Costs	\$7,236	\$37,251	\$44,487
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$120,000	\$1,112,363	\$1,232,363
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$2,650	\$3,747	\$6,397
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$550,412	\$16,561,083	\$17,111,495
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$20,789,145	\$24,107,285	\$44,896,430
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$21,339,557	\$40,668,369	\$62,007,926

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

Please see the individual project Budget Narrative Forms for an explanation for each project.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Grant Management

Budget Table: Project 1			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$54,212	\$191,379	\$245,591
2. Fringe Benefits	\$26,283	\$74,023	\$100,306
3. Travel	\$1,343	\$0	\$1,343
4. Equipment	\$1,534	\$4,180	\$5,714
5. Supplies	\$1,019	\$305	\$1,324
6. Contractual	\$0	\$36,365	\$36,365
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$19,727	\$19,727
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$84,391	\$325,979	\$410,370
10. Indirect Costs	\$1,777	\$13,136	\$14,913
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$2,650	\$3,747	\$6,397
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$88,818	\$342,862	\$431,680
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$88,818	\$342,862	\$431,680

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 1 Budget 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 Early Childhood Project Team Facilitator contract was awarded in October 2013. The procurement took longer than expected. Also, the appointment of the project teams took longer than anticipated. Therefore, all unspent funds from year 2 will be shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant and will be used for the same project.

Project 1 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 2 – Validation and Consumer Education

Budget Table: Project 2			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$5,804	\$53,616	\$59,420
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$5,804	\$103,616	\$109,420

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 2 Budget Table Narrative

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

A plan is in place to award the RFP for conducting an evaluation and validation study of the revised Step Up To Quality system in the spring of 2014. The funds from this project will be reallocated to years 3 and 4 of the grant.

Project 2 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Increase Access to High Quality Programs

Budget Table: Project 3			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$77,089	\$77,089
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$34,441	\$34,441
3. Travel	\$0	\$5,404	\$5,404
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$32,090	\$4,215,961	\$4,248,051
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$32,090	\$4,332,894	\$4,364,984
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$32,090	\$4,332,894	\$4,364,984
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$18,629,917	\$17,883,101	\$36,513,018
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$18,662,007	\$22,215,994	\$40,878,001

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 3 Budget Table Narrative

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

Due to staffing vacancies, the funds allocated for personnel and benefits were not expended as projected. There has been a revision to the timeline in completing the two pilot projects, which also resulted in funds not being expended in year 2. All of the unspent funds from year 2 will be shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant and will be used for the same project.

Project 3 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Maryland Collaboration

Budget Table: Project 4			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$22,505	\$46,683	\$69,188
2. Fringe Benefits	\$11,376	\$16,383	\$27,759
3. Travel	\$5,294	\$4,605	\$9,899
4. Equipment	\$0	\$1,470	\$1,470
5. Supplies	\$495	\$494	\$989
6. Contractual	\$85,500	\$1,417,291	\$1,502,791
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$15,369	\$15,369
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$125,170	\$1,502,295	\$1,627,465
10. Indirect Costs	\$1,869	\$8,263	\$10,132
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$127,039	\$1,510,558	\$1,637,597
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$403,307	\$700,693	\$1,104,000
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$530,346	\$2,211,251	\$2,741,597

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 4 Budget 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 vendor is billing at a slower than anticipated timeframe but all funds have been obligated and are expected to be spent in this project as projected. Therefore, all unspent funds from year 2 will be shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant and will be used for the same project.

Project 4 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Professional Development and Formative Instruction Modules

Budget Table: Project 5			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0	\$0	\$0
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0	\$0	\$0
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$103,167	\$1,269,953	\$1,373,120
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$103,167	\$1,269,953	\$1,373,120

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 5 Budget 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 RFP for the Formative Instruction Modules was posted in January 2014. The procurement took longer than expected. Therefore the contract for this work will be awarded for implementation during grant years 3 and 4. The funds allocated for this project will be used for the same project and shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant. There was an increase in Federal Head Start Advisory Council Grant funding for this project which increased the original budgeted amount. Funding was used to support the development of new professional development on the Ohio Early Learning and Development Standards.

Project 5 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 6 – Professional Development Coordination

Budget Table: Project 6			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$21,363	\$45,461	\$66,824
2. Fringe Benefits	\$10,938	\$16,265	\$27,203
3. Travel	\$371	\$1,754	\$2,125
4. Equipment	\$0	\$1,469	\$1,469
5. Supplies	\$0	\$1,470	\$1,470
6. Contractual	\$0	\$4,068,374	\$4,068,374
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$13,563	\$13,563
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$32,672	\$4,148,356	\$4,181,028
10. Indirect Costs	\$1,769	\$7,910	\$9,679
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$120,000	\$1,112,363	\$1,232,363
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$154,441	\$5,268,630	\$5,423,071
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,425,162	\$1,931,936	\$3,357,098
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,579,603	\$7,200,566	\$8,780,169

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 6 Budget 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 Ohio Department of Health awarded a contract in October 2013 to hire and manage the regional health promotion consultants. The procurement and staff hiring process took longer than expected. Also, Ohio Department of Education funds for training and material costs originally budgeted for grant year 2 have been shifted to year 3 to align with statewide roll out needs to support training and implementation of the new assessment system. All unspent funds for both sets of work will be shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant and will be used for the same projects.

Project 6 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Measures of Quality

Budget Table: Project 7			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$21,742	\$45,745	\$67,487
2. Fringe Benefits	\$11,163	\$16,292	\$27,455
3. Travel	\$261	\$1,089	\$1,350
4. Equipment	\$0	\$1,470	\$1,470
5. Supplies	\$79	\$1,167	\$1,246
6. Contractual	\$148	\$104,033	\$104,181
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$13,596	\$13,596
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$33,393	\$183,392	\$216,785
10. Indirect Costs	\$1,821	\$7,941	\$9,762
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$35,214	\$191,333	\$226,547
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$35,214	\$191,333	\$226,547

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 7 Budget 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 RFP for the Measures of Quality was awarded in November 2013. The procurement took longer than expected. Therefore, all unspent funds from year 2 will be shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant and will be used for the same project.

Project 7 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Progressions of Credentials

Budget Table: Project 8			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0	\$0	\$0
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0	\$0	\$0
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$34,656	\$34,656
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0	\$34,656	\$34,656

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 8 Budget Table Narrative

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

This project does not include any grant funds. The deliverables outlined in the contract for the vendor who was selected for this project, were completed using fewer funds that originally anticipated. The unspent funds from other sources were shifted to Project 9 and Project 6 in order to support the technology needs of programs participating in the EC-CAS pilot project.

Project 8 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 9 – Alignment with Ohio's Core Knowledge Competencies (CKC)

Budget Table: Project 9			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$0	\$0
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0	\$0	\$0
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0	\$0	\$0
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$175,200	\$175,200
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0	\$175,200	\$175,200

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 9 Budget Table Narrative

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

This project does not include any grant funds. Unspent funds from other sources in Project 8 were shifted to this project.

Project 9 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 10 – Child Link System

Budget Table: Project 10			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$62,443	\$235,645	\$298,088
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$62,443	\$235,645	\$298,088
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$62,443	\$235,645	\$298,088
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$221,788	\$0	\$221,788
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$284,231	\$235,645	\$519,876

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 10 Budget Table Narrative

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

Timeline for completion of system development has shifted to February of 2014. The procurement with a third party vendor will be paid for in early 2014 once all work is completed. All unspent funds will be shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant to support the work in this same project.

Project 10 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 11 – Re-engineering Step Up To Quality and Licensing Database

Budget Table: Project 11			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$24,860	\$379,417	\$404,277
2. Fringe Benefits	\$12,915	\$142,190	\$155,105
3. Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$3,232,132	\$3,232,132
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$246,936	\$246,936
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$37,775	\$4,000,675	\$4,038,450
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$37,775	\$4,000,675	\$4,038,450
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$2,058,131	\$2,058,131
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$37,775	\$6,058,806	\$6,096,581

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 11 Budget 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 project timeline for system development of the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System (OCLQS) has been extended and as a result not all of the funds for year 2 of the grant were expended. All unspent funds will be shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant. All of the unspent funds will be used for the same project and have been re-allocated to the contract line item in order to facilitate the completion of the OCLQS system.

Project 11 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 12 – Child Assessment System

Budget Table: Project 12			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$8,287	\$39,724	\$48,011
2. Fringe Benefits	\$4,305	\$16,225	\$20,530
3. Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$365,493	\$365,493
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$12,592	\$421,443	\$434,035
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$12,592	\$421,443	\$434,035
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$12,592	\$421,443	\$434,035

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 12 Budget 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 project funds that were originally expected to be expended during year 2 of the grant, but project timelines were extended to allow for completion of the development of the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System (EC-CAS) at the Ohio Department of Education. With the completion of the system development for the EC-CAS, work on this project will resume in year 3 of the grant. All unspent funds will be shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant for this same project.

Project 12 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.

Budget Table: Project 13 – Sustain in the Early Grades

Budget Table: Project 13			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0
3. Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0
6. Contractual	\$0	\$207,044	\$207,044
7. Training Stipends	\$0	\$0	\$0
8. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0	\$207,044	\$207,044
10. Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	\$0	\$0	\$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0	\$0	\$0
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0	\$207,044	\$207,044
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0	\$0	\$0
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0	\$207,044	\$207,044

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 13 Budget 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 sub-grantee experienced initial challenges in recruiting families for this Sustain in the Early Grades program. However, the grantee has a successful recruitment strategy in place and families are participating as of April, 2013. All unspent funds will be shifted to years 3 and 4 of the grant for this same project.

Project 13 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's office. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Educations and Health and Human Services.